

Orange County Public Schools

Chain Of Lakes Middle



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Chain Of Lakes Middle

8700 CONROY WINDERMERE RD, Orlando, FL 32835

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

Demographics

Principal: Robert Walker

Start Date for this Principal: 7/18/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (51%) 2014-15: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

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>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	B	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Anderson, Cheron	Principal	As the principal, Mr. Anderson facilitates essential school leadership team efforts to evaluate schoolwide progress towards improvement goals, analyze daily instructional practices, monitor student progress, and develop data-driven action plans to achieve student success. Through routine disaggregation of various data sources, Mr. Anderson provides vision and collaborative protocols for meeting the needs of the teachers and students.
Fontaine, Derrick	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principal of operations, Mr. Fontaine monitors student engagement and student discipline through an active adoption of behavioral systems within the multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) framework. Mr. Fontaine progress monitors student learning and teacher effectiveness in science and Social Studies.
Slaughter, Angela	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principal of instruction, Dr. Slaughter plays an integral role in evaluating school wide programs, analyzing instructional practices and student data trends, and developing plans to maintain instructional strengths, while improving weaknesses. This is accomplished by monitoring and reviewing the implementation and effectiveness of best practice strategies in order to fully utilize the instructional framework and provide teachers and students with the highest level of support for success.
Correa, Allison	Other	As the ESOL Compliance Specialist, Ms. Correa's duty and responsibility on the school's leadership team is to ensure compliance regulations are met in regards to the school's English language learners. This includes ensuring all testing, documentation, and services are provided for these students to be successful. As an instructional leader, Ms. Correa observes daily lessons and provides feedback and coaching assistance to classroom teachers. In addition to ensuring English language learners receive support at school, Ms. Correa assists with translation needs and organizes annual parent meetings. As a valued member of the leadership team, Ms. Correa plays an active role in making school decisions in order to provide an effective, efficient, and safe learning environment.
Coleman, Altresse	Instructional Coach	As the literacy coach, Mrs. Coleman's primary role is to work with teachers to support best practices in using data, make recommendations about potential next steps to address areas of need, and analyze school-wide trends in instruction. She takes a direct approach as an instructional leader to improve instruction and productivity by working to increase the effectiveness of ELA and Reading instruction. This includes modeling lessons, helping teachers plan instruction, and facilitating professional development. Mrs. Coleman engages stakeholders through the implementation of school and district-wide reading initiatives.
Powell, Kimberly	Other	As the school's SAFE Coordinator, Mrs. Powell's job is to promote a safe, orderly, and caring environment. This is accomplished by planning and implementing school wide programs to reduce school violence and engage students in appropriate behaviors and activities that promote character, and

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>facilitate academic growth. As a member of the leadership team Mrs. Powell conducts monthly threat assessment meetings, involves parents and community as the on-site advocate, monitors student behavior, and develops intervention programs for improvement. Mrs. Powell also serves on the school crisis team, as well as the student services team, and facilitates all referrals for mental health counseling services to local agencies. Mrs. Powell routinely assists the administrative team and school resource officer with security concerns; this is accomplished by participating in professional growth opportunities, conducting restorative justice counseling sessions, and effectively managing conflict within the school setting.</p>
<p>Santiago Alejandro, Cassandra</p>	<p>Instructional Coach</p>	<p>As the math coach, Ms. Santiago Alejandro serves as a liaison between school administration and the math department. Ms. Santiago Alejandro guides the math department in the implementation of the standards-based and data-driven instruction; this is accomplished by facilitating the analysis and use of local and state assessment data to inform instructional and grouping practices. Through partnerships with community organizations, Ms. Santiago Alejandro facilitates math enrichment opportunities for students and families. By analyzing state assessment data, Ms. Santiago Alejandro initiates the school wide decisions that will positively impact student success in math.</p>
<p>Stoner, Ashley</p>	<p>School Counselor</p>	<p>As the lead guidance counselor, Mrs. Stoner collaborates with teachers, parents, and staff, to help students reach their full academic potential. This is accomplished by targeting the social, emotional, and personal needs of the student body, and sharing this expertise with the leadership team through deliberate student scheduling, facilitation of classroom lessons, and the implementation of student recognition programs. Through a partnership with community agencies, school social workers, and school psychologists, Mrs. Stoner ensures access to outside resources that our students may need. As an active member of the leadership team, Mrs. Stoner informs school-based decisions that directly impact the whole child.</p>
<p>Wyatt, Tameka</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>As the school staffing specialist, Mrs. Wyatt's role is to work with the faculty to ensure the school is in compliance with the ESE policies and procedures in relation to students with exceptionalities and disabilities. Mrs. Wyatt also works collaboratively with both ESE and general education teachers to ensure all students are academically successful. This is accomplished through ongoing professional learning communities, professional development, and meetings providing the most up to date federal, state and OCPS mandates.</p>

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	434	419	454	0	0	0	0	1307
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	71	56	0	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	78	83	0	0	0	0	200
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	129	103	0	0	0	0	364
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	170	160	0	0	0	0	469

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	95	127	109	0	0	0	0	331

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)

71

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/18/2019

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	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 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	151	168	201	0	0	0	0	520

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	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 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	151	168	201	0	0	0	0	520

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	50%	52%	54%	57%	52%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	52%	54%	60%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	45%	47%	56%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	48%	55%	58%	49%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	51%	55%	57%	55%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	50%	51%	50%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	48%	51%	51%	51%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	56%	67%	72%	68%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	434 (0)	419 (0)	454 (0)	1307 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	36 (92)	71 (85)	56 (91)	163 (268)
One or more suspensions	39 (69)	78 (84)	83 (56)	200 (209)
Course failure in ELA or Math	132 (163)	129 (154)	103 (239)	364 (556)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	139 (206)	170 (190)	160 (203)	469 (599)

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
06	2019	49%	52%	-3%	54%	-5%
	2018	36%	48%	-12%	52%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	36%	48%	-12%	52%	-16%
	2018	42%	48%	-6%	51%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
	2018	50%	55%	-5%	58%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	47%	43%	4%	55%	-8%
	2018	31%	35%	-4%	52%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	40%	49%	-9%	54%	-14%
	2018	40%	51%	-11%	54%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	15%	36%	-21%	46%	-31%
	2018	16%	32%	-16%	45%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-25%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	41%	49%	-8%	48%	-7%
	2018	44%	49%	-5%	50%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						

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

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	51%	66%	-15%	71%	-20%
2018	54%	66%	-12%	71%	-17%
Compare		-3%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	63%	18%	61%	20%
2018	81%	61%	20%	62%	19%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	53%	42%	57%	38%
2018	75%	65%	10%	56%	19%
Compare		20%			

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	20	47	40	18	44	47	16	39			
ELL	36	56	54	42	57	53	31	41	80		
ASN	78	63		78	56		70	75	88		
BLK	37	48	50	34	42	44	35	45	63		
HSP	51	59	53	51	57	55	46	55	78		
MUL	63	48		76	59			79			
WHT	67	60	70	66	56	70	70	78	81		
FRL	45	53	50	43	48	50	42	53	74		
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		

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
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		
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		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	547
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	73
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	66
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

The lowest performing data component was Math achievement. Overall, our students achieved 48% proficiency in Math. Although this is the lowest performing component, the overall Math proficiency of our students increased by 4% compared to the previous year. Yet, there is an emerging trend of our 8th grade students performing the lowest in Math achievement overall. The school's 8th grade cohort achieved 15% proficiency compared to 6th grade (47%) and 7th grade (40%). This is a 1% decrease for the grade level comparison, but a significant 25% decrease for the cohort comparison.

Contributing factors to the lower performance of 8th grade students in Math were the absence of comprehensive intervention programs, low participation of targeted students in support programs, and inadequate support for culturally responsive instruction. With the positive overall growth in Math achievement, the school leadership team is dedicated to increasing the proficiency for this group of students.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Social Studies achievement. Overall, the proficiency rate of our 7th grade students in Social Studies was 56%, which is a 4% decline from the prior year. Contributing factors to this decline were decreased reading proficiency levels of our 7th grade cohort, insufficient professional learning community structures and guidance, decreased monitoring of common planning practices, and inadequate support for culturally responsive instruction.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Social Studies achievement. Overall, the proficiency of our 7th grade students in Social Studies was 56%, compared to the state's average proficiency level of 72%. This is a -16% difference between the school and state proficiency levels in Social Studies.

There is a discernable connection to the school and state achievement levels for English Language Arts achievement. The proficiency of our 7th grade students in English Language Arts was 36%, compared to the state's average proficiency level of 52%. This represents an equal -16% difference between the school and state proficiency levels in English Language Arts. Decreased English Language Arts proficiency levels for students in the 7th grade cohort is a major contributing factor to the school and state gap; additionally, insufficient professional learning community structures and

guidance, decreased monitoring of common planning practices, and inadequate support for culturally responsive instruction contributed to the proficiency gap in social Studies achievement.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was learning gains for the lowest 25% in Math. Overall, students in the lowest 25% who achieved learning gains was 52%, compared to 35% the previous year. This 17% increase was one of the highest in the district for this data component. The new actions taken in this area were increasing cooperative learning structures during daily instruction, increasing identification and targeted strategies students performing in bottom quartile, and enabling teachers and staff to access and analyze data to monitor and address the progress of student subgroups. Our work to take our students from the lowest 25% to the rising 25% will continue in a positive direction.

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

Reflecting on the Early Warning System data, there are two potential areas of concern. The first area of concern is the suspension levels. The number of students suspended one or more times has remained consistent. Current data show that 209 students were suspended, compared to 200 students during the previous year. The second area of concern is that the grade level with the highest number of Level 1 students has consistently been our current 8th grade cohort. This is also the cohort of students with the lowest performance in English Language Arts and the greatest decline in Social Studies achievement. The leadership team will consider these potential areas of concern in the school's improvement initiatives.

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

1. Provide Empowering Environments
2. Accelerate Student Performance
3. Narrow Achievement Gaps

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Utilize Literacy Strategies to Accelerate Student Mastery of Content-Specific Complex Text and Rigorous, Standards-Aligned Tasks.
Rationale	Decreased English Language Arts proficiency levels for students in the 7th grade cohort is a major contributing factor to the school and state gap for Social Studies achievement. Developing and monitoring teachers' and students' capacity to utilize literacy 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, engagement, and mastery of learning standards. As a result, we will be able to focus on accelerating student performance.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The intended outcome is that students will show measurable performance increases in the classroom and on the Florida Standards Assessments. Specifically, the goal is for students to increase proficiency levels in English Language Arts (58%), Math (54%), Science (56%), Social Studies (64%), Acceleration (85%), learning gains in English Language Arts (62%) and learning gains in Math (59%) achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cheron Anderson (cheron.anderson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	In an effort to achieve these outcomes, literacy strategies will be used to enable students to comprehend and persevere through complex texts. Teachers will Increase cognitive and conative engagement of all students through academic discussion to prepare for writing. Teachers will plan and facilitate opportunities for all students to utilize literacy strategies to write with evidence in response to complex texts, across all content areas. Additionally, teachers will open up classroom practice to increase pedagogical expertise in literacy across content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Through monitoring and modification of instructional practices based on student evidence and professional learning, we will build students' capacity to independently use literacy strategies to be successful with complex texts and master standards in all content areas.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement strategies to sustain high-performing teams by participating in district-wide initiatives to support teachers with using literacy strategies. 2. Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning to support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts. Resource teachers will 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 through the implementation of literacy strategies. Teachers will engage in evaluation of planned learning tasks for alignment to the rigor of the Florida Standards. 3. Use distributive leadership to progress and sustain collective efficacy and a culture of continuous improvement. The leadership team will develop a structured system for

monitoring teacher and student progress. Monitoring for teachers will be differentiated based on need and will be determined during classroom walkthroughs and observations. Monitoring for student mastery will occur through PLC data chats and school-wide progress monitoring tasks.

Person Responsible Altresse Coleman (altresse.coleman@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Utilize Culturally Responsive Instruction to Narrow the Achievement Gap and Provide an Empowering Environment
Rationale	According to the school grade component data, there is a significant achievement gap between our subgroups. Two demographic subgroups of the student population demonstrate an outstanding disparity – students with disabilities and black students. The most evident indicator is that students categorized as a student with a disability or as Black have consistently made the fewest learning gains in English Language Arts and Math learning proficiency. Providing structured support and guidance for culturally responsive teaching will facilitate more effective and inclusive instruction. Active student engagement in research-based, culturally responsive instructional practices, coupled with the effective use of monitoring and collaborative learning strategies, will help the school meet the diverse learning needs of students. The result will be narrowed achievement gaps and the cultivation of empowering learning environments.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The main intended outcome of focusing on culturally responsive instruction is that at least 59% of our Gap students will achieve learning gains in English Language Arts and at least 58% of our Gap students will achieve learning gains in Math. Additionally, we intend for at least 41% of our students with disabilities and Black subgroups, in the lowest 25th percentile, to achieve learning gains in English Language Arts and Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Angela Slaughter (angela.slaughter@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provide culturally responsive instruction during daily classroom learning activities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The initiative will be supported by best instructional practices related to cooperative learning, inclusion, student engagement, and comprehensive monitoring. 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, inclusive instruction, differentiated engagement, and monitoring of student learning. The leadership team will continuously provide support for cultivating culturally responsive instruction, monitor for evidence of effective implementation, and provide support to PLCs.
Action Step	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Research best practices in culturally responsive instruction and acquire accessible and tangible resources. 2. Provide opportunities for professional growth and implementation of culturally responsive instruction.
Description	3. Monitor implementation of culturally responsive instructional strategies. This is an integral component of the action step which requires the leadership team to collect evidence of lessons that reflect deliberate collaboration, inclusion, engagement, and monitoring strategies. 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 be captured through teacher lesson plans which will reflect rich and meaningful learning experiences and PLC

and data forms reflecting the use of data to drive instruction.

4. Monitor the impact of culturally responsive instructional strategies. The leadership team will accomplish this by conducting weekly classroom observations and reviewing common assessment and progress monitoring data to determine the impact of implemented strategies.

Person Responsible Derrick Fontaine (derrick.fontaine@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).

The Teacher-Student Mentorship Program is a program that will encourage positive relationships between our teachers and students. These programs will be a powerful way for students to learn skills, develop self-awareness and confidence, practice new behaviors, and better understand how to deal with some of the issues life presents. Working with students in groups, will provide students with additional support from others who are experiencing similar situations or have adjusted well after experiencing a related situation in the past. It is important that students feel a sense of value and belonging.

Chain of Lakes will continue to use the school-wide policies and procedures that have been in place to provide uniformity and consistency. The school-wide supervision plan will include greeting and monitoring students throughout the school day. The Student Code of Conduct will be reviewed with students on a quarterly basis and our student support team will meet weekly to discuss specific interventions and strategies. In addition to reviewing the Student Code of Conduct, students will spend the last five minutes of their lunch time engaged in character education that will enhance and encourage positive behavior on campus and in life.

Celebrating student success has been an ongoing activity at Chain of Lakes Middle School. "Double O" is a recognition program employed by faculty and staff to celebrate student success. The Outstanding Osprey (also known as "Double O") Award Program will provide opportunities to recognize students who have demonstrated good citizenship, academic excellence, or that goes above and beyond what is asked of them in any area of campus life. "Double O" is celebrated four times during the school year in a formal setting with teachers, parents and Partners in Education.

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.

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Utilize Literacy Strategies to Accelerate Student Mastery of Content-Specific Complex Text and Rigorous, Standards-Aligned Tasks.	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Utilize Culturally Responsive Instruction to Narrow the Achievement Gap and Provide an Empowering Environment	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00