Oak View Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Oak View Middle School

1203 SW 250TH ST, Newberry, FL 32669

https://www.sbac.edu/oakview

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Armstrong

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 5-8
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)	50%
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: A (62%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (60%) 2014-15: A (68%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Alachua 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

Oak View Middle School

1203 SW 250TH ST, Newberry, FL 32669

https://www.sbac.edu/oakview

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 5-8	No	57%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	37%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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.

The mission of Oak View Middle School is to provide 21st century skills that will inspire lifelong learning and prepare our students to be literate and productive citizens.
The mission of the Center for Advanced Academics and Technology magnet at Oak View is to prepare students to become lifelong learners and achievers in sophisticated scholastic and technical arenas as they pursue their educational and professional goals in a digital age.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Oak View Middle School is a center of excellence where children can achieve full potential in their academic, technological, creative, personal and moral development in and outside the classroom.

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
Armstrong, Kelly	Principal	
Sailor, Sharon	Assistant Principal	
Lynch, Matt	Assistant Principal	
Jones, Garrett	Dean	
Campbell-Choice, Eugenia	Dean	
Bradley, Lakeysha	School Counselor	
Schweim, Emily	School Counselor	
Scott, Bobbi	Teacher, K-12	
Caffrey, Ryan	Teacher, K-12	
Butler, Sheri	Teacher, K-12	
Marlowe, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	
Flournoy, Ernestine	Teacher, K-12	
Merton, Karen	Teacher, K-12	
Whiddon, Danielle	Teacher, K-12	
Copeland, Jasmyn	Teacher, K-12	
Pirzer, Lori	Teacher, K-12	

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	128	279	260	260	0	0	0	0	927
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	11	21	30	36	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	7	12	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	23	33	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	38	66	42	66	0	0	0	0	212

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	3	17	25	36	0	0	0	0	81

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	1	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	11

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
55

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/20/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	4	7	9	11	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	12	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	17	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	33	46	66	63	0	0	0	0	208

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	7	8	17	11	0	0	0	0	43

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	64%	59%	54%	63%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	56%	54%	58%	59%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	41%	47%	38%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	63%	60%	58%	64%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	60%	56%	57%	60%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	46%	51%	45%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	60%	53%	51%	56%	57%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	77%	73%	72%	79%	72%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	5	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	128 (0)	279 (0)	260 (0)	260 (0)	927 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	11 ()	21 ()	30 ()	36 ()	98 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	10 (0)	7 (0)	12 (0)	29 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	9 (0)	23 (0)	33 (0)	65 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	38 (0)	66 (0)	42 (0)	66 (0)	212 (0)

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 oe 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
05	2019	56%	55%	1%	56%	0%
	2018	58%	55%	3%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
06	2019	67%	53%	14%	54%	13%
	2018	61%	55%	6%	52%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
07	2019	64%	54%	10%	52%	12%
	2018	65%	55%	10%	51%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	64%	61%	3%	56%	8%
	2018	72%	61%	11%	58%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	56%	57%	-1%	60%	-4%
	2018	61%	61%	0%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
06	2019	61%	52%	9%	55%	6%
	2018	49%	53%	-4%	52%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	63%	59%	4%	54%	9%
	2018	68%	58%	10%	54%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
08	2019	24%	27%	-3%	46%	-22%
	2018	20%	24%	-4%	45%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	54%	55%	-1%	53%	1%
	2018	53%	55%	-2%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	62%	54%	8%	48%	14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	58%	53%	5%	50%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

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	76%	69%	7%	71%	5%
2018	79%	69%	10%	71%	8%
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	92%	56%	36%	61%	31%
2018	85%	60%	25%	62%	23%
Compare		7%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	48%	52%	57%	43%
2018	100%	63%	37%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	22	44	40	20	35	29	23	24			
ELL	30			20							

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
ASN	100	54		100	85				100		
BLK	26	39	34	26	39	32	25	55	82		
HSP	58	59	68	56	55	40	54	75	87		
MUL	56	52	29	60	55	19	55	74	85		
WHT	74	65	46	73	65	51	70	84	89		
FRL	42	47	39	39	44	36	40	62	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
SWD	24	33	24	19	33	29	19	32			
ASN	100	93		100	93				90		
BLK	34	52	53	28	41	35	36	44			
HSP	67	62	37	61	59	53	54	79	75		
MUL	68	57	40	66	52	21	52	72	92		
WHT	71	66	48	69	62	44	62	91	85		
FRL	45	54	48	43	46	37	40	65	71		
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	24	35	31	28	43	41	15	55			
ASN	100	73		100	82						
BLK	30	47	38	25	40	35	25	48	55		
HSP	60	53	55	66	65	65	55	94	88		
MUL	60	61	40	60	45		55	83			
WHT	71	61	34	73	65	48	64	83	75		
FRL	42	49	35	45	50	42	36	62	60		

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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	557
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	25
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	88
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	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
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	54
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	
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	69
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	47
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.

At Oak View Middle School, the group with the lowest performance are our Students with Disabilities. This has historically been the case, in large part due to the challenges of providing differentiated instruction and accommodations to meet the needs of these diverse learners.

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

Two areas showed the greatest declines from previous years. Our Civics achievement dropped by 4%. This was likely due to the fact that one of our two civics instructors was out for half of the year, and the class was taught by several long term subs. Although extremely helpful in providing instruction to our students, the very high bar set by our more experienced, certified teachers was difficult to attain.
The other area of greatest decline was our ELA gains. The previous school year had seen a large jump in gains scores, particularly in the 8th grade cohort that moved on to high school. The reduction brought us back closer to the ELA gains of the previous years.

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 largest gap between our school and the state average was in our lowest quartile math gains. As a school, we have historically underperformed compared to the state when comparing the bottom quartile. Our ELA bottom quartile gains are 5% lower than the state average, and in math is is double that at 10% below state average. Meanwhile, our achievement in both areas is well above state average.

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

The area of largest increase was in our Science achievement scores. The primary change made during the previous school year related to science was a major overhaul of how our school ran science fair. During previous years, every student would complete a science fair project, and the class time allocated to the fair and its projects was significant. Last year, the school adopted an optional science fair model in which the vast majority of work was completed outside of class. This meant that teachers had more instructional time available for teaching important science content.

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

Our main indicator of concern is the number of students with an achievement level of 1. This indicator impacts the most number of students by far. Beyond the individual indicators, we are also especially concerned with those students who display 2 or more of the indicators, as they are at an even higher risk of not being successful.

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

1. Increase Achievement of Students with Disabilities
2. Increase Lowest Quartile ELA and Math Gains
3. Decrease the achievement gap between White and Black students, by increasing African American Achievement in ELA and Math.
4. Increase Achievement of ELL students
5. Decrease African American Suspensions

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase achievement of students with disabilities by 11%
Rationale	When analyzing subgroups, our SWD subcategory well below the federal target of 41%. For that reason, and because students with disabilities also fall in multiple other categories, this is an area in need of targeted improvement.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the percentage of students with disabilities scoring level 3 or higher on the FSA ELA and Math assessment to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Increasing the number of students in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) in both ELA and Math UDL training facilitated by district staff. Additionally, Oak View is participating in the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (BEESS) middle grades math team. This will provide Tier III support to teachers at Oak View in using data to identify trends. The support will include a deep dive into school data, along with targeted strategies for our students with disabilities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Over the last two summers, we have worked with district ESE specialists to determine the best placement for students using the flexible scheduling method. The goal of these sessions has been to get students into the LRE where they will have the best opportunity to be successful. Now that these students are in the LRE, training will be offered to support teacher in offering learning experiences that are accessible to all learners via the UDL training.

Action Step	
Description	1. Flexible Scheduling 2. Needs Assessment to determine need for training 3. UDL Training 4. Classroom Walkthroughs 5. Co-Teach Trainings
Person Responsible	Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)

#2	
Title	Increase the percentage of students in the lowest quartile who demonstrate learning gains in ELA and Math by 5%
Rationale	While our achievement and growth scores in Math remain above district and state averages, our bottom quartile is the one math category where students underperform compared to their peers across the district and state. Due to the success in general education classrooms, a focused effort to reduce the number of students in self contained environments. In order to ensure success in these new environments, all co-teachers attend training on best practices in these environments. Additionally, all staff will be offered training opportunities in UDL in order to ensure that leaning opportunities are accessible for all students. During the 2019-2020 school year, we are also continuing a collaboration between the school and district staff in which the tuning protocol (developed by the School Reform Initiative) will be used to review lessons from ELA classes.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Bottom quartile growth on the FSA Math and ELA assessments as reported by the state will increase by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	-Increase the number of Co-Taught classes -District Math PLC Participation -UDL Training -Math Textbook Training -Oak View is participating in the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (BEESS) middle grades math team. This will provide Tier III support to teachers at Oak View in using data to identify trends. The support will include a deep dive into school data, along with targeted strategies for our students with disabilities. -Tuning Protocol Training (ELA)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Almost a third of our bottom quartile in math and ELA are ESE students. For this reason, any goals related to the bottom quartile should pay close attention to this sub group within a subgroup. Much like our overall goals for ESE students, we have increased the number of students in co-taught classes as opposed to self contained math classrooms. We are also providing a UDL training that will ensure all teachers are trained in offering the most accessible learning opportunities for all students. This year, we are implementing a new math curriculum, and training on the new materials will be crucial to the success of the materials. For that reason, our math teachers were offered several opportunities to receive training in the new materials. Teacher also have the chance to receive ongoing support through a district math PLC, which allows teachers to collaborate with teachers across the district.

Action Step	
Description	1. Flexible Scheduling 2. Math Textbook Trainings 3. UDL Training 4. Classroom Walkthroughs

Person Responsible	Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)

#3	
Title	Decrease the Achievement Gap between White and Black students by increasing African American Achievement in ELA and Math by 3 %
Rationale	The achievement gap at Oak View is above district average, which is above state average. For the 2019 testing year, black students underperformed white peers by 48% in ELA and 47% in Math.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Achievement in Math and ELA for black students will increase by 3%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	-Provide teachers monthly EWS reports for black students who are not on track for promotion. -Implement and monitor culturally responsive instructional practices in classes -District Math PLC Participation -UDL Training -Math Textbook Training -Oak View is participating in the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (BEESS) middle grades math team. This will provide Tier III support to teachers at Oak View in using data to identify trends. The support will include a deep dive into school data, along with targeted strategies for our students with disabilities. -Tuning Protocol Training (ELA)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Improving instruction across campus for all learners will benefit every student on campus. Ideally, this will improve achievement across the board. However, due to the disparity in achievement, it is also necessary to have specific goals that are aimed at improving achievement for our black students.
Action Step	
Description	1. UDL Training 2. Tuning Protocol Training 3. Culturally responsive classroom professional development 4. Classroom walkthroughs
Person Responsible	Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)

#4	
Title	Increase the achievement of ELL students by 16%
Rationale	ELL proficiency is our lowest subgroup at only 25% proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELL proficiency will increase as indicated on the federal report card by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Ensure ESOL certified teachers are providing instruction for ELL students Offer training in culturally responsive instruction The school will offer 2 parent nights for parents of ELL students. During these meetings, we will also meet with the parent leadership council.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	It is imperative that our ELL students receive our most highly qualified teachers who are ESOL endorsed, and capable of providing the differentiated instruction that ELL students need in order to be successful. In addition, culturally responsive classrooms will improve the learning environment for a diverse group of ELL students.
Action Step	
Description	1. Scheduling to ensure ESOL endorsed teachers are teaching ELL students 2. Culturally responsive classroom training 3. Classroom walkthroughs
Person Responsible	Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)

#5	
Title	Decrease the number of African American suspensions by 15%
Rationale	African American students are suspended at a disproportionately higher rate than their peers of any other race. Suspensions lead to lost instructional time and lost learning. We aim to decrease the number of suspensions by reducing the infractions and behaviors that lead to suspensions.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will decrease the number of suspensions given for African American students by 15%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Matt Lynch (lynchmc@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implementation of PBIS Development and use of discipline matrix Use of Restorative practices
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our primary goal is to reduce the behaviors that lead to suspensions. PBIS will support us in our efforts to explicitly teach behaviors that are appropriate for the school environment, and reward those positive behaviors. When negative behaviors do occur, it is important that we attempt to implement more restorative rather than punitive consequences.

Action Step	
Description	1. Continue implementation of PBIS 2. Development of discipline matrix 3. Continued use of restorative practices 4. Training on restorative practices
Person Responsible	Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)

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 V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase achievement of students with disabilities by 11%			$2,280.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0591 - Oak View Middle School			$980.00

			Notes: UDL Training costs including materials and substitute days for teachers. FLMS conference for teachers to support professional growth in the area of SWD.			
			0591 - Oak View Middle School			$1,300.00
			Notes: FLMS Conference costs for teachers to provide professional growth in order to support our SWD population.			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Increase the percentage of students in the lowest quartile who demonstrate learning gains in ELA and Math by 5%**				**$860.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0591 - Oak View Middle School			$560.00
			Notes: Algebra Nation books for use in Algebra classes.			
			0591 - Oak View Middle School			$300.00
			Notes: Stipend and materials for summer "bridge" program from students who took 7th grade math and are now going in to Algebra 1.			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Decrease the Achievement Gap between White and Black students by increasing African American Achievement in ELA and Math by 3 %**				**$450.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0591 - Oak View Middle School			$450.00
			Notes: ELA tuning protocol training sub days.			
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Increase the achievement of ELL students by 16%**				**$300.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0591 - Oak View Middle School			$300.00
			Notes: Materials and supplies for ELL parent nights.			
5	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Decrease the number of African American suspensions by 15%**				**$2,500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0591 - Oak View Middle School			$2,500.00
			Notes: Budget allocation from PTO to support PBIS initiatives, including school store inventory and special events.			
					Total:	**$6,390.00**