

Marion County Public Schools

Ocali Charter Middle School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Ocali Charter Middle School

3233 SE MARICAMP RD STE 106, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Elias Posth

Start Date for this Principal: 1/7/2016

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: F (28%) 2015-16: D (34%) 2014-15: D (39%)
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

N/A

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	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	18

Ocali Charter Middle School

3233 SE MARICAMP RD STE 106, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

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>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>79%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>53%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	F	D

School Board Approval

N/A

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 Ocali Charter Middle School is to provide middle school students an opportunity to secure the highest quality education that embraces core values.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Ocali Charter Middle School is to enable our students to become exemplary citizens, enjoy learning, be able to engage in critical thinking, and to demonstrate mastery of educational benchmarks and leadership skills to become successful, productive, and contributing graduates/citizens of the future.

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
Matthews, Theresa	Other	
Sheib, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
Posth, Elias	Principal	
Shows, Kelly	Teacher, ESE	

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	43	61	37	0	0	0	0	141
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	11	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	7	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	18	10	0	0	0	0	47

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	33	32	27	0	0	0	0	92

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)

9

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/6/2019

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	22	13	9	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	23	13	0	0	0	0	55

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	29	34	24	0	0	0	0	87

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	22	13	9	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	23	13	0	0	0	0	55

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	29	34	24	0	0	0	0	87

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	49%	49%	54%	29%	45%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	54%	54%	32%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	46%	47%	22%	36%	44%
Math Achievement	43%	54%	58%	22%	47%	56%
Math Learning Gains	49%	58%	57%	30%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	50%	51%	41%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	47%	46%	51%	27%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	70%	72%	26%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	43 (0)	61 (0)	37 (0)	141 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	11 (22)	11 (13)	11 (9)	33 (44)
One or more suspensions	9 (6)	6 (6)	7 (6)	22 (18)
Course failure in ELA or Math	4 (0)	3 (2)	2 (4)	9 (6)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	19 (19)	18 (23)	10 (13)	47 (55)

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	33%	45%	-12%	54%	-21%
	2018	54%	44%	10%	52%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	59%	46%	13%	52%	7%
	2018	37%	43%	-6%	51%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	51%	50%	1%	56%	-5%
	2018	48%	49%	-1%	58%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	26%	46%	-20%	55%	-29%
	2018	28%	42%	-14%	52%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	49%	49%	0%	54%	-5%
	2018	47%	49%	-2%	54%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				
08	2019	50%	41%	9%	46%	4%
	2018	50%	43%	7%	45%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	46%	44%	2%	48%	-2%
	2018	26%	46%	-20%	50%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
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	74%	65%	9%	71%	3%
2018	60%	64%	-4%	71%	-11%
Compare		14%			

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	0%	54%	-54%	61%	-61%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	57%	-57%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			

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	20	33		13	33	36					
ELL		27		8	17	20					
BLK	20	47		15	37						
HSP	40	47	41	35	46	42		61			
WHT	63	56		55	57		68	88	7		
FRL	43	52	53	38	44	39	44	71	8		

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	13	57	60	27	57						
ELL	8	33		8	55						
BLK	27	53		20	40						
HSP	40	50	64	26	45	54		33			
WHT	61	58	57	53	51	64	32	73			
FRL	42	51	63	35	46	54	20	48			

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		23		14	25						
BLK	14	8		7	31						
HSP	20	30		10	5						
WHT	35	36	36	30	39		33	26			
FRL	30	33	25	17	28	40	19	24			

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
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	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	14
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
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	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	56
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	44
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.

Math Achievement at an overall 49% proficient was the data component that showed the lowest performance. 6th grade 26%, 7th grade 49% and 8th grade 50%. The 2019 6th grade population was a major contributing factor to the low performance in the achievement area with 74% of the 6th grade students not proficient. This population has become a trend, thereby making a urgent need of our school to dig into the data and start MTSS immediately.

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

Math Lowest 25 percentile was the data component to show the greatest decline from the prior year at 12 points. From 55% to a 43%. The contributing factor continues to be the 6th grade population in Mathematics.

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.

6th grade math had the greatest gap with the state average at a 29% difference. 32 students were not proficient.

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

Science was the component that showed the most improvement. By increasing for 27% to 47%. This is a direct result of analyzing and dissecting the science grade level materials based on standards.

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

1. Over 65% of the OCMS student exhibit two or more Early Warning Indicators.

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

1. Increase the number of student proficient in Math.
2. Increase the overall growth of lowest 25 percentile in Math.
3. Prioritize 6th grade interventions by cloning our 7th grade efforts.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	6th Grade Math
Rationale	The data indicates that the area of greatest need in Ocali Charter is 6th Grade Math.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If 6th grade level 1 and 2 math students are scheduled for an intensive math course with a focus on fundamental math skills then 35% of those students will increase their math fsa score by at least 1 sub level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Theresa Matthews (theresa.matthews@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Adding intensive math to level 1 and 2 student schedules allows time for the teacher to teach the non proficient student from their level to build a strong Mathematical foundation. This allows such students to pass their regular math class and rise to the level of proficient score on the FSA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Based on entrance FSA scores of incoming 6th graders from 2018 and 2019 the need for foundational skills is imperative.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitor effectiveness by reviewing I ready data each quarter. 2. The intensive math teacher will work and plan in partnership with the general math teacher to monitor student progress and direct instruction. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Elias Posth (elias.posth2@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Professional Development
Rationale	In 2019, three areas of ESSA subgroups fell below the federal index of 41%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If a deliberate, sustainable, and applicable professional development program, with areas of focus on students who are below the ESSA federal index of 41%, is implemented throughout the school year then student growth in FSA ELA will increase from 49% to 52% and MATH will increase from 43% to 46%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Theresa Matthews (theresa.matthews@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Professional development will begin with a data dig of I Ready scores, from that analysis areas of need will be determined for both students and teachers driving the PD.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	I Ready diagnostic tools are researched based and give measures of student growth. This information will allow our professional development to be organic as we pair teachers together in a tandumn learning style to enhance both teachers through the learning process. Our Content Area Specialist, Mr. Posth, will support the reflection and think tank of the teams that are being conducted.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reveiw I Ready Data 2. Needs Assessment of Teachers 3. Pairing of Teacher/Learners with similar needs 4. Use of TNL and book studies 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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).

N/A

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.

Ocali Charter Middle School uses the following communication to ensure that positive relationships with families occurs.

Flexible Parent Meetings, the school scheduled orientation, open house and other meetings are held in the evening, this allows many of our parents to attend. Teachers are directed to do positive and discipline phone calls home to families. The school also focuses on building capacity through programs like readers are leaders, and math nights. Lastly we provide parents with a Calendar of Events, text communication between teachers and parents, blast emails, phone calls and an updated web site. Parents are encouraged to volunteer and have lunch with their child. OCMS also uses social media as a tool to share the current happenings various classrooms and overall school announcements.

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 students are very important to Ocali Charter Middle School. Their well-being emotionally and socially, especially at the middle school level is vital to their success. Our goal is to enable our students to become productive, contributing members of our school, society, and their community with an appreciation and acceptance of diversity. Administration works as a team with the school faculty, staff, parents and the community to create a climate and culture of caring and positiveness. Ocali Charter Middle School provides education, prevention, early identification and intervention that helps the students achieve academic, emotional, and behavioral success. Administration meets with students and parents each year in the interview process to assess a student's social and emotional needs. Students are mentored and progress monitored for progression and success. Courtesy calls are administered to parents to ensure successful forward motion from challenges. If additional programs are needed, the student will be referred to other services to meet their needs.

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

Ocali Charter Middle School employs the strategies to support incoming 6th graders through our Open House presentation.

All rising students participate in the End of the Year awards program for rising students.

The rising 9th graders participate in the End of the Year awards program to celebrate their success. High school visits and speakers round out the process.

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 Multi Tiered System of Support team meets pre-school week to review all the incoming and returning student information to flag students who require interventions or additional support in reading, math or science. Teachers will receive folders of student names with interventions listed and accommodations for 504 and ESE students.

Weekly meetings are held for the entire year to review all students for support and interventions. Students are identified as Red, Yellow and Green based on their performance in each subject. Data is

collected and shared with the Board of Trustees at regular Board Meetings. The Board meetings are open to the public and parents are encouraged to provide input on our school improvement plan. Data from the MTSS/RTI process is used to guide budget decisions on materials and staff professional development.

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

Ocali Charter Middle School uses many strategies to advance college and career awareness all year long. OCMS invites Guest speakers, including military and local law enforcement.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: 6th Grade Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Professional Development	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00