

Orange County Public Schools

Roberto Clemente Middle



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Roberto Clemente Middle

6000 ROBERTO CLEMENTE RD, Orlando, FL 32807

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

Demographics

Principal: Andrew Agudo

Start Date for this Principal: 5/25/2018

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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	13
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Roberto Clemente Middle

6000 ROBERTO CLEMENTE RD, Orlando, FL 32807

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	91%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Reussow, Betzabeth	Principal	<p>As the primary leader in our building, Betzabeth Reussow has multiple roles and responsibilities. In order to effectively lead our school community she adheres to the Florida Principal Leadership Standards and district expectations. Her duties and responsibilities include: achieve results on the school's student learning goals which are based on the state's adopted student academic standards and the district's adopted curricula; ensure student learning results are evidenced by the student performance and growth on statewide assessments, district assessments, international assessments and other indicators of student success adopted by the district and state; demonstrate that student learning is the top priority by enabling staff and faculty to work as a system focused on student learning, maintaining a school climate that supports student engagement in learning, generating high expectations for student learning growth and engaging faculty and staff in efforts to close learning gaps among subgroups of students; work collaboratively to develop and implement an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs and assessments; retain and develop an effective and diverse faculty and staff; structure and monitor a school learning environment that improves learning for a diverse student population; employ and monitor a decision-making process that is based on the vision, mission, and data for school improvement; develop and support other leaders in the organization; manage the school, operations, and facilities in ways that maximize the use of resources to promote a safe, efficient, legal and effective learning environment; employ effective communication that build and maintain relationships with stakeholders, using oral, written and electronic modes; and, demonstrate personal and professional behaviors consistent with those of a community leader who exhibits quality professional and ethical behavior.</p>
Kuczer, Kenneth	Dean	<p>Mr. Kuczer communicates regularly with parents and guardians through a variety of means to discuss individual student discipline. This includes written, face-to-face and digital communication that is intended to inform parents as well as solicit input from parents regarding plans to assist students with improving choices. He also supports the classroom teachers by creating a discipline plan and implementing interventions and strategies based on PBIS and Restorative Justice. He ensures compliance with all discipline related documentation, and monitors discipline data. He also works collaboratively with the other dean, MTSS coach, PASS coordinator and Student Services department to ensure that students' needs are met.</p>
Caballero, Rafael	School Counselor	<p>Mr. Caballero is our counselor leader. Along with two other counselors , Ms. Baringer and Ms. Azucey, he works closely with the API and teachers to provide individual and group counseling services to meet the academic and social needs of students, coordinate and assist with implementation of student services in the school, assist teachers with Guidance curriculum, provide professional learning opportunities to faculty and staff and address the inquiries and/or concerns of parents and families.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Estevill Perez, Annette	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Annette Estevill-Perez works closely with the APs to provide teachers with content knowledge and resources through our professional learning community. In her role as the instructional coach, she also researches best practices and prepares materials for use by classroom teachers, assists teachers with monitoring common assessment data to drive instruction, models lessons and instructional strategies, and observes instruction and provides feedback to teachers.
	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Acevedo works closely with the guidance counselors and teachers to ensure the delivery of instructional programs and services to our students with disabilities. In her role as the staffing specialist, she facilitates the process of determining the initial eligibility and placement of students and change of eligibility and/or placement of students in the exceptional education program. She reviews academic, health, speech, language, and/or psychological evaluations, and works with the all relevant staff and the students' families to create Individual Educational Plans (IEP). She further ensures adherence to federal, state and district legislation regarding students with disabilities; and, she advocates for students by educating staff on procedural safeguards and responsibilities of classroom teachers.
Rivera, Marlene	Other	As our Curriculum Compliance Teacher Ms. Rivera guarantees that the needs of our English Language Learners are met. Her duties and responsibilities include: monitoring for compliance with established legislation and any additional district expectations, serving as a resource to the school principal, staff, and parents regarding procedures, State Board c-Rules and the Florida Consent Decree, assessing, evaluating, and monitoring the individual progress of each student in the ESOL program, updating student records, serving as the school contact for all state reporting and FTE survey periods (state compliance audit) and data corrections regarding ESOL through each FTE survey and managing annual testing of ELL students.
Baumbach, Timothy	Assistant Principal	Mr. Baumbach is our curriculum leader and works closely with the principal, counselors and coaches to develop, evaluate and implement instructional programs. As the Assistant Principal of Instruction he systematically considers new ways of implementing research-based interventions in the classroom to increase student achievement, creates the school master schedule, facilitates collaboration among teachers by creating schedules for horizontal and vertical planning and design of relevant, engaging instructional lessons, leads the development of the school improvement plan, leads meetings with teachers and parents to discuss curriculum, instruction and assessment, creates processes for providing students access to a variety of instructional tools (e.g.: technology) and best practices for meeting diverse student needs and evaluates teacher performance based on state and district guidelines.
Lebron Fonollosa, Nelly	Instructional Media	Ms. Lebron Fonollosa, our Media Specialist, facilitates weekly and monthly book clubs for students, maintains an updated collection featuring books in

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		the home-languages of our students, rewards students who read books from a variety of genres through the Reading Passport program, arranges for guest speakers such as published poets and authors and local athletes, organizes Hispanic Heritage Celebration for the students and community, promotes reading across ability levels with the Reading Passport program, which allows students to earn rewards and incentives regardless of Lexile level and monitors digital device sign-outs and ensures that student laptops are signed out to all students.
Lemanski, Daniela	Instructional Coach	Ms. Lemanski works closely with the administrators to provide teachers with content knowledge and resources related to mathematics. In her role as the math coach she researches best practices and prepares materials for use by classroom teachers, monitors data to drive instructional practice, models lessons and instructional strategies, leads mathematics professional development, observes and provides feedback to teachers.
McQueen, Carmen	Assistant Principal	Ms. McQueen is our student discipline and Restorative Practices leader. She is also responsible for school daily operations, attendance, and working routines in the building. As part of her daily tasks Ms. McQueen works closely with the deans, counselors and SAFE coordinator to document discipline concerns, makes fair decisions and maintains consistent, open communication with parents regarding student behavior, actively takes part in the hiring process, recruiting and retaining high-quality workforce in the school, creates processes to identify and solve school-based problems in a fair, democratic way, uses effective communication that provides for the timely sharing of information with the school community and district staff, meets weekly with attendance clerk to monitor attendance data and make decisions about interventions needed, leads meetings with teachers to ensure IB and AVID programs are being implemented as intended, and evaluates teacher performance based on state and district guidelines.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 5/25/2018, Andrew Agudo

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

61

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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 .	

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	392	354	335	0	0	0	0	1081	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	117	98	0	0	0	0	300	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	22	30	0	0	0	0	62	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	105	152	0	0	0	0	289	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	36	33	0	0	0	0	134	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	73	88	0	0	0	0	279	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	98	124	0	0	0	0	327	

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	127	125	162	0	0	0	0	414	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/8/2020

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		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	359	362	299	0	0	0	0	1020	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	89	63	0	0	0	0	220	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	71	55	0	0	0	0	178	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	107	65	0	0	0	0	225	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	171	174	144	0	0	0	0	489	

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	83	125	87	0	0	0	0	295

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	9

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	359	362	299	0	0	0	0	1020
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	89	63	0	0	0	0	220
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	71	55	0	0	0	0	178
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	107	65	0	0	0	0	225
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	171	174	144	0	0	0	0	489

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	83	125	87	0	0	0	0	295

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	9

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%	52%	54%	48%	52%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	52%	54%	48%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	45%	47%	37%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	44%	55%	58%	47%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	45%	55%	57%	49%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	51%	44%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	40%	51%	51%	44%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	63%	67%	72%	69%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	41%	52%	-11%	54%	-13%
	2018	37%	48%	-11%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	45%	48%	-3%	52%	-7%
	2018	36%	48%	-12%	51%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	43%	54%	-11%	56%	-13%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	58%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	20%	43%	-23%	55%	-35%
	2018	14%	35%	-21%	52%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	36%	49%	-13%	54%	-18%
	2018	43%	51%	-8%	54%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
08	2019	33%	36%	-3%	46%	-13%
	2018	35%	32%	3%	45%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	34%	49%	-15%	48%	-14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	37%	49%	-12%	50%	-13%
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	56%	66%	-10%	71%	-15%
2018	50%	66%	-16%	71%	-21%
Compare		6%			
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	65%	63%	2%	61%	4%
2018	61%	61%	0%	62%	-1%
Compare		4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	53%	39%	57%	35%
2018	81%	65%	16%	56%	25%
Compare		11%			

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	8	31	33	12	38	40	4	17			
ELL	24	46	43	27	42	44	14	41	59		

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	88	71		94	78		95	93	100		
BLK	53	48	20	40	43	53	35	66	88		
HSP	41	49	43	38	43	48	29	59	77		
MUL	50			50							
WHT	72	63		58	44	33	72	78	77		
FRL	41	47	36	37	42	47	31	58	76		
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	9	29	32	11	22	22	18	19			
ELL	17	38	35	20	30	31	20	35	35		
ASN	86	72		96	70		75	90	98		
BLK	44	48	50	43	30	32	36	60	65		
HSP	42	46	39	40	37	36	42	52	65		
WHT	65	55		61	51	44	59	70	76		
FRL	41	45	41	42	37	37	41	55	61		
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	17	37	34	18	41	38	30	44			
ELL	15	34	35	18	40	45	8	36	53		
ASN	90	83		92	70		89	91	96		
BLK	49	49	31	44	59	53	41	74	75		
HSP	42	43	36	39	44	42	36	64	64		
WHT	64	60	55	70	61	38	68	88	91		
FRL	48	48	37	47	49	43	44	69	73		

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	519
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

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 data component that showed the lowest performance was science at 40% proficient. This decline from the previous year can be explained considering multiple contributing factors: insufficient coaching support for teachers; diminished monitoring of data from common formative and summative assessments, including district provided Progress Monitoring Activities (PMA's); and, inconsistent use of high-yield instructional strategies among science teachers.

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 science, with a decrease of 5%. The contributing factors include teacher attrition and instructional practice. The 8th grade students who tested were impacted by loss of a teacher during their 6th grade year. They did not have a consistent teacher, but instead multiple teachers over the course of their 6th grade year. This affected content learned and retained. Additionally, instructional practice suffered as the science coach taught a class for over half the school day. As a result, teachers did not receive the benefits of consistent monitoring, modeling of effective instructional strategies and regular feedback that come with having an instructional coach consistently in the classroom.

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.

Math achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Only 44% of our students reached proficiency, while 58% of students in the state reached proficiency. This 14% disparity can be attributed to: employee attrition in the math department; students identified as ideal candidates for math tutoring did not attend tutoring sessions; monitoring, feedback and modeling by

math coaches was too infrequent; formative and summative assessment data was not utilized in the planning process to help guide instruction.

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 in the bottom quartile of math. Achievement in this quartile increased to 48%, a gain of 11% from the previous year. Small group instruction provided by instructional coaches and support staff helped to close the achievement gap for these students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Course failure for English Language Arts and Math in 7th grade has been the highest for two consecutive years. Four hundred eighty-nine students received a level one on the state assessment.

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

1. Increase math by 5% to 49% and ELA proficiency by 5% to 52%
2. Decrease the achievement gap in math and ELA for our ELL & SWD students
3. Decrease the number of students with Level 1's on state assessments in ELA & math
4. Decrease the number of students with Early Warning Indicator - Course Failure
5. Increase science proficiency by 10% to 50%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Our goal is to build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: decrease the number of students with Level 1's on state assessments in ELA and math and decrease the number of students with the Early Warning Indicator - Course Failure. In 2019, 51% of students received levels 1 or 2 on the ELA state assessment; 56% of students received levels 1 or 2 on the state math assessment; and, 60% of students received levels 1 or 2 on the state science assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

As a result of implementing professional learning for social and emotional learning, students will increase ELA, math and science state assessment scores by 6%, 5% and 5%, respectively. We will also monitor for improvement in Early Warning Indicators data (decline in the number of course failures); improved summative and district assessment data (PMA's); and, Cognia survey data (improved results in the Purpose and Direction and Governance and Leadership categories).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Betzabeth Reussow (betzabeth.reussow@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We will use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs and adult needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

One action step will be to: Understand how social and emotional learning is connected to instructional strategies: We will include social and emotional learning as a part of the schoolwide discipline plan. Teachers will be trained on how to develop classroom management procedures to reduce the frequency of classroom disruptions and the number of students disengaged from learning. Teachers will also be trained on the interconnectivity of instructional practice, student learning, discipline, social and emotional learning, restorative practices, PBIS, trauma-informed practices and culturally responsive learning. Teachers and staff will be provided with instructional strategies and best practices to implement.

Person Responsible

Betzabeth Reussow (betzabeth.reussow@ocps.net)

Another action step will be to: Monitor, measure and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts: Instructional coaches and administrators will monitor and provide feedback from observations and student learning data to open up conversations with teachers about instructional practice and impacts of implementation on course failure.

Person Responsible Betzabeth Reussow (betzabeth.reussow@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our goal is to build and establish a culture that prioritizes student engagement as a part of standards-based learning. Student learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with other students through meaningful activities. By ensuring that our school has a culture for student engagement, we will address the following school needs: increase math proficiency by 5%, to 49%; increase science proficiency by 5%, to 45%; and, decrease the number of Level 1's in ELA and math on state assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of standards-based instruction with an emphasis on student engagement, 54% of students will earn a 3, 4, or 5 on the state reading assessment; 49% of students will earn a level 3, 4, or 5 on the state math assessment; and, 45% of students will earn a level 3, 4, or 5 on the state science assessment. We will also monitor for: improved formative and summative assessments (including PMA's offered by the district) for all students; improved classroom and assessment performance data for students attending tutoring and pull-out groups; improved teacher evaluation ratings that indicate implementation of student engagement strategies that lead to improved student learning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Timothy Baumbach (timothy.baumbach@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use the Marzano framework, instructional coaching, data analysis and distributive leadership to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to refine student learning. Specifically, our school will focus on getting students to demonstrate what new information they learned through the analysis of similarities and differences and producing and defending claims. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented strategies through analysis of feedback from teachers and students, needs assessments, and classroom observations. We will adjust the plan of action as established by the data, student needs and teacher needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies deepen students' understanding of content knowledge and enhance retention, decision-making, critical thinking and problem solving. In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of our school building. To create a culture in which students are actively engaged in authentic, standards-based learning activities, it is paramount to harness the professional skills and leadership potential of everyone in the school. Through distributive leadership, our school will fortify the team dynamics necessary to effect change and improve student learning. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through distributive leadership, effective instructional strategies, coaching and data analysis our school will increase math and science proficiency and decrease the number of level 1's in ELA and math on state assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

We will establish a common language to support implementation of effective instructional strategies that improve student engagement during standards-based learning. As instructional coaches and administrators complete observations and provide feedback, facilitate instructional rounds with teachers, organize peer observations and model effective instructional practice for teachers, a common language emerges that establishes high expectations for student engagement for students, faculty and staff.

Person Responsible Timothy Baumbach (timothy.baumbach@ocps.net)

We will monitor and modify instruction as a result of data-based conversations about the impacts of student engagement on student learning. Ongoing collaborative discussions about the effects of student

engagement on student learning will occur as teachers meet as professional learning communities. These discussions will lead to data-based instructional decisions that meet the needs of all students.

Person Responsible Timothy Baumbach (timothy.baumbach@ocps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

We will build and establish a culture that meets the needs of all students, specifically our English Language Learners (ELL) and Students with Disabilities (SWD). Academic learning is enhanced when ELL's and SWD's have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to content. By ensuring that the needs of our ELL's and SWD's are met, we will address the following school needs: decrease the achievement gap in math and ELA for our ELL & SWD students. In 2019, 8% of SWD's and 24% of ELL's earned a level 3, 4 or 5 on the state reading assessment; 12% of SWD's and 27% of ELL's earned a level 3, 4, or 5 on the state math assessment; and, 4% of SWD's and 14% of ELL's earned a level 3, 4, or 5 on the state science assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

As a result of standards-based instruction, 10% of SWD's and 26% of ELL's will earn a level 3, 4 or 5 on the state reading assessment; 14% of SWD's and 29% of ELL's will earn a level 3, 4, or 5 on the state math assessment; and, 6% of SWD's and 16% of ELL's will earn a level 3, 4, or 5 on the state science assessment. We will monitor for the following measurable outcomes: improved formative and summative assessments (including PMA's offered by the district) for ELL and SWD students; improved classroom and assessment performance data for ELL and SWD students; improved teacher evaluation ratings that indicate implementation of effective instructional strategies that lead to improved student learning for ELL and SWD students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carmen McQueen-McNealy (carmen.mcnealy@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We will use the Marzano framework, instructional coaching, data analysis and distributive leadership to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to refine student learning for our ELL and SWD students. Specifically, our school will build background knowledge and support text-dependent writing instruction where ELL's write routinely over extended time frames and shorter time frames for a range of tasks, purposes and audiences. Also, our school will build up our system of how we analyze data, analyze instructional practice, and make necessary adjustments that improve outcomes for our SWD students. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented strategies through analysis of feedback from teachers and students, needs assessments, and classroom observations. We will adjust the plan of action as established by the data, student needs and teacher needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of our school building. To create a culture in which ELL and SWD students are actively engaged in authentic, standards-based learning activities, it is paramount to harness the professional skills and leadership potential of everyone in the school. Through distributive leadership, our school will fortify the team dynamics necessary to effect change and improve student learning. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through distributive leadership, effective instructional strategies, coaching and data analysis our school will decrease the achievement gap in math and ELA for our ELL and SWD students.

Action Steps to Implement

We will establish a common language to support implementation of text-dependent writing to improve standards-based learning for our ELL students and data-based instructional decisions for our SWD students. As instructional coaches and administrators complete observations and provide feedback, facilitate instructional rounds with teachers, organize peer observations and model effective instructional

practice for teachers, a common language emerges that establishes high expectations for ELL and SWD students as well as for the faculty and staff with whom they interact.

Person Responsible Carmen McQueen-McNealy (carmen.mcnealy@ocps.net)

We will monitor and modify instruction as a result of data-based conversations about student learning, specifically ELL and SWD students. Ongoing collaborative discussions about student learning will occur as teachers meet as professional learning communities. These discussions will lead to data-based instructional decisions that meet the needs of our ELL and SWD students.

Person Responsible Carmen McQueen-McNealy (carmen.mcnealy@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

In order to close the gap between the math performance of our school and that of the district and state, we will provide opportunities for our teachers to observe teachers at other schools that achieved higher math proficiency. These opportunities will extend teachers' scope of practice, providing the chance to glean high-yield instructional strategies that can be shared and implemented at our school. Additionally, professional learning opportunities outside of our school will further broaden teacher's schema. Research-based professional learning provided by the district, state or another organization enlarges our cadre of instructional strategies and expands our professional learning community.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, our school engages in ongoing professional learning for social and emotional learning. We utilize the distributive leadership model, to promote positive relationships and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Further, we use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. Our school leadership team collaborates with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council and Parent Academy. The School Advisory Committee (SAC) takes an active role in reviewing the School Improvement Plan and provides feedback to school leadership. Our Parent Engagement Liaison is instrumental in

ensuring that our parents are well informed and receive support as needed and requested. Open communication is consistent between the school and the community via Connect Orange messages, marquee notices and the Jaguar Journey newsletter. English classes for parents are provided on site throughout the school year and are taught by school staff. Mentors for students are provided via a partnership with AmeriCorps and Engelwood Neighborhood Center. Staff members also mentor select students. ADDitions volunteer opportunities are available to parents and the community. We have hosted volunteers from the University of Central Florida as well. Through a partnership with Second Harvest Food Bank, staff members and students and their families receive fresh produce each month. School pride and spirit is promoted through campus beautification projects in which staff, students and the community participate.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$3,675.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6150	300-Purchased Services	1111 - Roberto Clemente Middle	Title, I Part A	1032.0	\$3,675.00
<i>Notes: Hero</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement				\$9,350.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	500-Materials and Supplies	1111 - Roberto Clemente Middle	Title, I Part A	1032.0	\$9,350.00
<i>Notes: Math Nation</i>						
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$9,623.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	1111 - Roberto Clemente Middle	Title, I Part A	1032.0	\$3,646.00
<i>Notes: Edmentum</i>						
	5000	399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	1111 - Roberto Clemente Middle	Title, I Part A	1032.0	\$5,977.00
<i>Notes: Renaissance Learning</i>						
Total:						\$22,648.00