Odyssey Middle

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Odyssey Middle

9290 LEE VISTA BLVD, Orlando, FL 32829

https://odysseyms.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Barbara Rumph

Start Date for this Principal: 3/1/2018

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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

Odyssey Middle

9290 LEE VISTA BLVD, Orlando, FL 32829

https://odysseyms.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	No	66%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	84%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	B

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
Smith, Beatriz	Principal	Ms. Beatriz B. Smith - Principal; Responsible for overseeing curriculum and instruction, data analysis to ensure student achievement increases, and managing the learning environment.
Mendoza, Sonia	Other	Mrs. Sonia Mendoza - PASS Coordinator; Helps students maintain focus on academics when serving in an alternative to suspension program, provides social skills lessons to students, and conducts restorative justice circles as needed.
Kitts, Natalie	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Natalie Kitts - Instructional Coach/Testing Coordinator; Works with teachers to improve instruction and uses research-based strategies during instructional planning to obtain the maximum results possible in regards to student achievement.
Maldonado, Javier	Dean	Mr. Javier Maldanado - 7th/8th Grade Dean; Maintains a safe and orderly environment for students, facilitates restorative justice practices, and fosters positive relationships with students, faculty, and parents.
Finnin, Traci	Instructional Media	Ms. Tracy Finnin -Media Specialist; Assists teachers with selecting appropriate literature in the classroom for instruction and to increase reading by students. Assists teachers with digital implementation and best practices related to digital instruction in the classroom.
Ninah, Charisse	Assistant Principal	Ms. Charisse Ninah - Assistant Principal; Creates a master schedule that allows focus on student instruction to meet the needs of all students, oversees the Curriculum Council/PLCs, shares research-based practices with teachers through ongoing instructional leadership methodologies, and assists principal in curriculum and instruction, and data analysis.
Pritz, Jill	Assistant Principal	Ms. Jill Pritz- Assistant Principal; Monitors MTSS, oversees the ESE department, develops and implements the teacher induction program, shares research-based practices with teachers through ongoing instructional leadership

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		methodologies, and assists principal in curriculum and instruction, and data analysis.
Aloyo, Lucia	School Counselor	Ms. Lucia Aloyo -7th/8th Grade Guidance Counselor; Creates student schedules based on student needs, courses offered, tracks student performance in classes throughout the school year, and state requirements. The counselor provides responsive services, goal-focused counseling for students' social/emotional needs.
Greene, Felice	School Counselor	Ms. Felice Greene - 6th/7th Grade Guidance Counselor; Creates student schedules based on student needs, courses offered, tracks student performance in classes throughout the school year, and state requirements. The counselor provi
Alexander, Julie	Instructional Coach	Ms. Julie Alexander-ECS/MTSS Coach; Assists teachers with interventions for the MTSS process. ESOL CT; Responsible for ESOL compliance concerns which includes testing students for the ESOL program and monitoring their progress. Provides ELL strategies to teachers as needed.
Stanley, Lori	Other	
Ramos, Bianca	Other	Behavior Specialist. Responsible for assessing students with behavior issues, collecting data on the students, working with teachers, counselors, and school psychologists to devise a behavior plan for the student, and evaluating the effectiveness of the plan.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 3/1/2018, Barbara Rumph

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.*
13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
48

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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	253	253	272	0	0	0	0	778
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	54	79	0	0	0	0	156
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	13	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	81	100	0	0	0	0	196
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	53	31	0	0	0	0	114
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	48	44	0	0	0	0	128
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	45	47	0	0	0	0	124

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	39	75	93	0	0	0	0	207

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	12	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/7/2020

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	282	312	284	0	0	0	0	878
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	37	43	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	43	32	0	0	0	0	124
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	49	43	0	0	0	0	173
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	76	116	0	0	0	0	268

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	70	63	57	0	0	0	0	190

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	282	312	284	0	0	0	0	878
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	37	43	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	43	32	0	0	0	0	124
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	49	43	0	0	0	0	173
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	76	116	0	0	0	0	268

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	70	63	57	0	0	0	0	190

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	2	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	55%	52%	54%	56%	52%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	52%	54%	53%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	45%	47%	38%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	54%	55%	58%	58%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	50%	55%	57%	59%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	50%	51%	54%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	55%	51%	51%	54%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	75%	67%	72%	75%	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	50%	52%	-2%	54%	-4%
	2018	47%	48%	-1%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	53%	48%	5%	52%	1%
	2018	44%	48%	-4%	51%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
	2018	57%	55%	2%	58%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	28%	43%	-15%	55%	-27%
	2018	34%	35%	-1%	52%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	53%	49%	4%	54%	-1%
	2018	51%	51%	0%	54%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
08	2019	33%	36%	-3%	46%	-13%
	2018	16%	32%	-16%	45%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	51%	49%	2%	48%	3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	54%	49%	5%	50%	4%
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	73%	66%	7%	71%	2%
2018	59%	66%	-7%	71%	-12%
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	82%	63%	19%	61%	21%
2018	83%	61%	22%	62%	21%
Compare	-1%				

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	90%	53%	37%	57%	33%
2018	88%	65%	23%	56%	32%
Compare	2%				

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	21	40	35	23	32	30	18	38			
ELL	31	49	46	33	41	39	29	52	82		

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	75	64		81	69		83	82	93		
BLK	50	58	38	45	45	45	45	73	78		
HSP	52	56	48	50	49	44	54	72	79		
MUL	79	71		64	57						
WHT	61	56	39	67	50	30	56	83	88		
FRL	47	52	43	49	47	42	46	70	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	23	36	26	24	30	24	32	34			
ELL	14	38	43	25	37	33	22	34			
ASN	71	49		78	60		91	65	95		
BLK	42	41	38	40	44	32	49	69	70		
HSP	49	47	41	49	46	38	53	60	83		
MUL	87	65		70	76				83		
WHT	63	52	42	63	51	72	76	64	89		
FRL	46	45	38	47	45	38	47	60	80		

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	10	24	28	11	48	51	7	38			
ELL	20	33	34	29	52	51	19	38			
ASN	78	71		83	64		85	86	100		
BLK	46	45	42	48	58	69	45	73	89		
HSP	53	51	36	56	57	48	46	71	91		
MUL	88	63		84	71				77		
WHT	65	62	50	65	65	61	78	85	91		
FRL	48	48	37	50	56	51	46	66	91		

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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	582
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%

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%	2

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	78
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	53
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	57
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	68
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 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	59
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	54
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.

Schoolwide data indicates the lowest 25% in ELA and math are the lowest components (45% in ELA and 42% in math scored on grade level). The lowest 25% ELA and math data are trending by having the lowest scores in both 2018 and 2019. The ELA performance of these students has increased by five (5) percentage points in 2019 (45%) as compared to 2018 (40%). Additionally, the math performance of these students has increased by two (2) percentage points in 2019 (42%) as compared to 2018 (40%). Students With Disabilities (SWD) and ELL students scored the lowest for both ELA and Math Achievement. ELA Achievement scores were 21% for SWD and 31% for ELL students. Math Achievement scores were 23% for SWD and 33% for ELL students. Grade-level data indicates the lowest performing area for all students was 6th grade math with only 28% of students performing at or above grade level. In 2018, 34% of all 6th grade students performed at or above grade level, which is a six (6) percentage point decrease compared to 2018. A contributing factor to last year's low performance among all 6th grade students was student suspensions. There was a greater percentage of students in 6th grade earning suspensions (16.7%) compared to students in 7th (13.5%) and 8th (10.9%) grades.

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

All areas showed improvement except Science and Middle School Acceleration (MSA). Science declined by four (4) percentage points and MSA by one (1) percentage point. Science Achievement for all students had the greatest decline when compared to the previous year where the percentage points dropped by four (4) percentage points from 59% to 55%. In 2018, 59% of students demonstrated proficiency and in 2019, 55% of students demonstrated proficiency. There is a

correlation between the decline in overall student Science performance and a decline in 8th grade Science performance. Eighth grade Science data indicates a decline of three (3) percentage points from 2018 to 2019. A contributing factor for the decline was student attendance. The number of 8th grade students with attendance below 90% was the greatest (29%) compared with 7th (21%) and 6th (9%). The early warning indicator of attendance below 90% increased dramatically from 2018 to 2019 for all grade levels.

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.

Odyssey's Math Learning Gains for the lowest 25% had a nine percentage point differential with the state. The score for the school was 42%; whereas, the state was at 51%. Math Learning Gains followed with a seven percentage point differential when compared to the state. The data sub-component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is 6th grade math. In 2019, 28% of students demonstrated proficiency in math compared to the state average of 55%. This is a 27 percentage point differential compared to the state. In 2018, 34% of students demonstrated proficiency in 6th grade math compared to the state average of 52% which is an 18 percentage point differential when compared to the state. ELL data indicates 20.3% achievement in ELA compared to non-ELL students (56.8%). ELA learning gains for ELL students is 33.3% compared to non-ELL learning gains (54.3%). In math, ELL data indicates 21.5% achievement in math compared to non-ELL students (46.3%). Math learning gains for ELL students is 32.3% compared to non-ELL learning gains (38.6%). This gap in ELA achievement has been consistent at Odyssey Middle School School based on year-to-year data trends. Contributing factors for these gap trends are student suspensions and a lack of teacher proficiency in small group instruction and the implementation of instructional strategies that address the learning and social-emotional needs of ELL students and SWD.

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

Social Studies (Civics) data increased 11 percentage points in 2019 (75%) compared to 2018 (64%). The Civics department/PLCs engaged in data meetings throughout the school year to discuss student achievement outcomes. During this time teachers engaged in using data outcomes with a focus on test item specifications, alignment of activities and standards. Additionally, the department utilized the District PLC strategies and culturally responsive instruction strategies to meet the needs of all students. This year, as a digital school, our Civics team included the use of digital tools to enhance instruction and consistently progress monitor. The formative data collected throughout the course of the unit was used to inform instruction and provide remediation on a consistent and ongoing basis, as needed.

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

An area of concern would be the percentage (13.7%) of students who earned suspensions; the percentage exceeds that of the learning community (5.8%) and district (8.4%). A second area of concern would be 29% of students who earned a level 1 on the ELA FSA and/ or the Math FSA compared to the learning community (17.3%) and district (19.6%).

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

1. To increase the learning gains for the lowest 25% in ELA and math to at least 50%
2. To increase learning gains in ELA and math to at least 60%
3. To establish a culture of inclusive education that promotes high expectations to all students
4. To establish a plan for discipline with the goal of decreasing the number of suspensions and increasing student attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: Increase student achievement outcomes in the areas of ELA and Math Rationale: Even with Odyssey's increases in the majority of components and a letter grade of a B, continued focus is needed for ELA and Math. Strengthening teachers' understanding of content standards as well as planning for the delivery of instruction will support the teaching and learning processes to produce gains in student achievement. The 2019 data indicated the need to increase overall student achievement, learning gains, and learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA and math. The data shows declines in each of the reporting categories from the 2018 to 2019 assessment. Strategically focusing on these areas will aid in increasing student achievement outcomes in ELA and Math.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome is to increase student achievement, learning gains, and learning gains of the lowest 25% ELA Achievement - 65% ELA Learning Gains - 60% ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% - 50% Math Achievement - 65% Math Learning Gains - 55% Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% - 50%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use common formative and summative assessments data to identify interventions and re-teach standards for which mastery has not been met. PLCs will use UNIFY and CRMs assessments. Instructional coaches will monitor data and the use of assessments throughout the year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Common assessments on same standards will be given by two or more teachers with the intention of examining the results. Some goals of examining these common assessments are to have teachers discuss and analyze their question-writing style and content, individual plans for student success, and an opportunity to look at what modifications need to be made during curriculum planning and classroom instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will collaborate with instructional coaches during PLC to create and examine assessments' for rigor, reliability and the inclusion of the assessment components: question types, assessment length, complexity levels, and clearly written directions (every two to three weeks).
2. When creating the assessments, grade-level and content area teams will agree on what students will need to know to demonstrate mastery for each unit, . This will occur prior to each unit (every two to three weeks).
3. When planning units, grade-level and content area teams will address PLC questions (every Thursday during PLC) with a focus on instruction, assessment, intervention and enrichment. This will occur prior to each unit (every two to three weeks).
4. Administrators will meet with department teams to analyze data, determine how standards mastery is being addressed, and next steps regarding target interventions or extension of learning opportunities for students who have reached mastery (every month).

Person Responsible	Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Odyssey Middle School will build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students and parents have opportunities to build meaningful relationships with teachers and other students. Students with meaningful connections at school will be more engaged, attend school more often, and interact positively with others to 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: The 2019 data indicates a need to decrease the early warning indicator of attendance below 90 percent. 2019 data showed an increase in the early warning indicator of attendance below 90 percent from 2018 for all grade levels. According to data, 2019 attendance below 90 percent increases substantially from 6th (9%) to 7th (21%) to 8th (29%) grades. Though absentee rates were lower in 2018, this trend of increased absenteeism from lower to higher grades is evident as well. 2019 data on the early warning indicator of one or more suspensions shows a marked decrease from 2018 (108) to 2019 (34) as a result of social and emotional strategies such as SAFE, PASS, and restorative justice already in place. There is a need to maintain best practices and build meaningful relationships between school personnel, teachers and students.
Measurable Outcome:	Odyssey Middle School plans to improve Early Warning Systems indicator data of students with low attendance (the overall percentage of students with attendance below 90 percent will decrease from 20% to 17%), lowest 25% proficiency in math, ELA, Civics and Science, and students survey data indicating 75% agree/strongly agree with social emotional school support.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	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

The 2019 data indicates a need to decrease the early warning indicator of attendance below 90 percent. 2019 data showed an increase in the early warning indicator of attendance below 90 percent from 2018 for all grade levels. According to data, 2019 attendance below 90 percent increases substantially from 6th

(9%) to 7th (21%) to 8th (29%) grades. Though absentee rates were lower in 2018, this trend of increased absenteeism from lower to higher grades is evident as well. 2019 data on the early warning indicator of one or more suspensions shows a marked decrease from 2018 (108) to 2019 (34) as a result of social and emotional strategies such as SAFE, PASS, and restorative justice already in place. There is a need to maintain best practices and build meaningful relationships between school personnel, teachers and students.

Person Responsible   Lori Stanley (lori.stanley@opcs.net)

School personnel will establish contact and build relationships with families of students with the early warning indicator of attendance below 90 percent (weekly).

Person Responsible   Lori Stanley (lori.stanley@opcs.net)

Instructional coaches will support teachers to develop and implement strategies for establishing a culture of social and emotional learning with students (every two to three weeks).

Person Responsible   Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)

Administration, school psychologist, social worker, SAFE coordinator, Deans, and school personnel will review attendance and suspension data with a focus on creating action plans to engage students and parents in school (weekly).

Person Responsible   Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)

Deans, SAFE coordinator, PASS coordinator, Deans and school personnel will use restorative justice protocols and social skills lessons where appropriate to reduce the early warning indicator of student suspensions (weekly).

Person Responsible   Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)

SAFE coordinator, instructional coaches, and school personnel will plan and implement cycles of professional development to provide training and opportunities for safe practice around social and emotional learning (every semester).

Person Responsible   Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: District Professional Learning Community (DPLC) Writing Through Content Areas Rationale: In order for students to solve problems, analyze information, think critically, and communicate their ideas effectively, writing needs to be taught and practiced across content areas. With the support of the other content area teachers, our ELA data will improve.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable expected outcome for ELA is as follows: ELA Achievement component data increases by ten percentage points to 65%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	DPLC members will provide professional development to faculty members on the process of implementing a research-based approach for engaging students in the writing process- no matter the discipline. (CERCA) • State their Claim • Support their claim with Evidence • Explain their Reasoning by linking the evidence to the claim • Address Counterarguments • Use Audience-appropriate language
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	ELA, social studies, science, and math teachers often speaking different languages — to one another as well as to students. By implementing a unified, shared language for teaching writing across disciplines, teachers can collaborate more easily around instruction and improving individual student performance. CERCA allows teachers to engage students in the writing process by reinforcing the same literacy skills and concepts across content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

1. DPLC members will provide professional development to faculty members focusing on writing strategies (on a quarterly basis).
2. Teachers will participate in open practice to observe writing strategies being implemented across content areas and the use of higher level thinking activities (Socratic Seminars) to help students clarify their thoughts, consider alternative perspectives, and engage more thoroughly with a lesson on a monthly basis.
3. Teachers will plan for the implementation of writing strategies during PLC (Professional Learning Communities) scheduled weekly (on Thursdays).
4. Administration, leadership team, and DPLC members will provide feedback during the Curriculum Council and DPLC Liaison meetings (every month).
5. Writing strategies implementation data will be collected through walkthroughs on a weekly basis.
6. Support facilitation teacher will push in to work with SWD - the only subgroup that fell under the 41% ESSA - Federal Percent Points Index: four times a week (Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday)

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: SD- High Expectations for All Student With Disabilities was the only subgroup that did not meet the ESSA 41% Federal Percent Points Index criteria. Our is score is currently 30%. Rationale: School administrators communicate expectations for all school personnel to share responsibility for all of the students in their building and consider all academic learning needs of SWD.
Measurable Outcome:	50% of students with disabilities will be proficient in the areas of ELA and Math as well as be enrolled in Fine Arts electives.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Inclusive Practice - Administrator and school leaders will set clear expectations as to recognize the diversity of students, enable all students to access course content, fully participate in learning activities and demonstrate their knowledge and mastery of standards at assessment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Inclusive education allows students to be part of their community and develop a sense of belonging. It provides better opportunities for learning. A partnership between families and school is a vital part of the process. As much as possible, parents will be included in special celebrations and recognitions throughout the school year.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Behavior Specialist and Guidance Counselors will be part of PLC to go over students' plans and answer questions about specific services, accommodations and modifications listed on the plans on a monthly basis. 2. Professional development opportunities on differentiation of instruction and behavior management will be offered to all teachers (throughout the year).
3. All teachers will incorporate Life Skills in their planning to help students with time management, organizational skills, self-reflection and setting academic and personal goals (weekly).
4. SWD will have an active part in any school performances and celebrations as scheduled (throughout the year).
5. As much as possible, parents and families will be included in celebrations of their students achievements (on a quarterly basis).

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. Teachers will collaborate with instructional coaches during PLC time to create and examine assessments' rigor and reliability (every Thursday).
2. When creating the assessments, each grade-level and content area team will be in agreement on what students will be responsible for mastering by the end of each unit. This will occur prior to each unit (every two to three weeks).
3. When creating the assessments and planning units, each grade-level and content area team will explore the following questions: A) What do we expect students to know? B) How will we know that they have learned it? C) How will we respond if they don't learn it? D) How will we respond if they do? This will occur prior to each unit (every two to three weeks). These questions will also serve as a discussion guide during PLCs (every Thursday).
4. When creating the assessments, each grade-level and content area team will confirm that each assessment includes the following components: various question types (i.e., multiple choice, multi-select, etc.), assessment length, various cognitive complexity levels, and clear directions (every two to three weeks).
5. Administrators will have data talks with department teams to analyze the effective use of data, foster open communication and consistency, determine how standards mastery is being addressed, and engage in next step conversations focused on the implementation of target interventions or extension of learning opportunities for students who master the standard (every month).

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.

1. Maintain a high rate of positive interaction with students and show a genuine interest in their lives, their activities, their goals and their struggles. Plan to establish a Student Ambassador Program to help establish and maintain positive relationships with students and staff. Students will meet with leadership to address students concerns, issues, needs and serve as a voice to our student population and be engaged in decision-making processes.
2. Plan to integrate social skills instruction by establishing a Social Emotional Learning Committee, identifying resources, and working with teachers to integrate social skills instruction. Implement Class Craft (a student engagement and management system) to teach students collaboration, motivate students and

build collaboration and teamwork skills.

3. Teach students how to problem solve using SODAS as we engage them in counseling sessions and RJ Circles (S – Define the SITUATION, O – Examine OPTIONS available to deal with the problem, D – Determine the DISADVANTAGES of each option, A – Determine the ADVANTAGES of each option, S – Decide on a SOLUTION and practice.

4. Meet with key stakeholders (i.e., SAC & PTSA) to discuss and determine social emotional opportunities.

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: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				$17,571.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	520-Textbooks	1682 - Odyssey Middle	Other		$14,071.00
			Notes: FSA consumables			
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	1682 - Odyssey Middle	General Fund		$3,500.00
			Notes: Provide half-day planning for teachers to analyze data and plan instructional focus calendar.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				$3,115.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6150	399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	1682 - Odyssey Middle	Other		$3,115.00
			Notes: HERO Teacher/Parent communication software to track positive behavior, discipline issues, and student attendance			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$428.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5200	510-Supplies	1682 - Odyssey Middle	Other		$428.00
			Notes: Skill buildings supplies for the ESE units			
					Total:	$21,114.00