Orange County Public Schools

Memorial Middle



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| | |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| | |
| School Information | 7 |
| | |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| | |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| | |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 21 |
| | |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Memorial Middle

2220 W 29TH ST, Orlando, FL 32805

https://memorialms.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Eddie Foster Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2020

| 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (32%) 2015-16: D (36%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | ormation* |
| 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 | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Memorial Middle

2220 W 29TH ST, Orlando, FL 32805

https://memorialms.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 | 97% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | С | С | С | D |

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 |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Holmes, Kenisha | Principal | Oversee all school policies, procedures, faculty, and the overall operation of Memorial. Ensure all students have access to a rigorous education, as well as all teachers are provided coaching and support with a focus on engaging standards based instruction. |
| Brennan, Cindy | Assistant Principal | Creates the master schedule, ensures all students have accurate schedules, oversees testing, and works closely with the Math and Social Studies departments. Provides actionable feedback and coaching to teachers with a focus on engaging standards based instruction. |
| Amoda, Pamela | Instructional Coach | Language Arts and Reading support: facilitates the Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings and common planning, oversees the lesson plans and resources, and provides actionable feedback based on engaging standards based instruction. |
| Brazley, Gary | Dean | Oversees 6th grade discipline and provides classroom management support to the 6th grade teachers. |
| Mitchell, Eddie | Dean | Oversees 7th grade discipline and provides classroom management support to the 7th grade teachers. |
| Cotton, Terri | Other | SAFE Counselor and Title IX Coordinator - handles all Threat Assessment meetings, oversees and facilitates Restorative Justice, and works with the guidance counselors on student concerns. |
| Panzella, Adam | Instructional Coach | Core Math and Intensive Math support: facilitates the Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings and common planning, oversees the lesson plans and resources, and provides actionable feedback based on engaging standards based instruction. |
| Hess, Jennifer | Other | Testing Coordinator and Curriculum Resource Teacher - organizes and oversees all district and state testing, trains teachers on testing procedures and expectations, assists teachers with certification procedure, and helps organize school data. |
| Galvin- Prepetit, Roseanne | Assistant Principal | Oversees both discipline and Title 1, ensures the facilities are safe and operating efficiently. Works closely with the Reading, Elective and ESE departments. Provides actionable feedback and coaching to teachers with a focus on engaging standards based instruction. |
| Pickett, Tiffany | Dean | Oversees 8th grade discipline and provides classroom management support to the 8th grade teachers. |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Lorenzo, Amber | Instructional Coach | Science support: facilitates the Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings and common planning, oversees the lesson plans and resources, and provides actionable feedback based on engaging standards based instruction. In addition, helps with Intensive Math support. |
| Rusho, David | Other | ELL/ESOL CCT - organizes and facilitates the WIDA testing, new student ELL testing and placement, and ensures all ELL students receive language support, and creates the ELL para-professional schedule to ensure students are receiving support services. In addition, helps with Title 1 documentation. |
| Ellis McKay, Lanoma | Instructional Coach | Reading support: facilitates the Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings and common planning, oversees the lesson plans and resources, and provides actionable feedback based on engaging standards based instruction. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/10/2020, Eddie Foster

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.

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

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 a asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
|--|---|
| | 2018-19: C (49%) |
| | 2017-18: C (46%) |
| School Grades History | 2016-17: D (32%) |
| | 2015-16: D (36%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (S | l) Information* |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 338 | 294 | 257 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 889 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 49 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 30 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 25 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 35 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 79 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 249 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 103 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 286 |

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

| Indicator | | Indicator Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 92 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 281 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | | | | | G | rad | e Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | 6 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/10/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | | | | | | | Grad | de Lev | el | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|--------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 288 | 301 | 287 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 876 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 61 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 85 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 225 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 32 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 | 169 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 425 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | (| Grad | e Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 92 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 247 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| la dia atau | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | | | | | | | Grad | de Lev | /el | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|--------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 288 | 301 | 287 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 876 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 61 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 85 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 225 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 32 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 113 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 | 169 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 425 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | (| Grad | e Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| maicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 92 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 247 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| la dia stan | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |

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).

| Sahaal Grada Campanant | | 2019 | | | 2018 | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 35% | 52% | 54% | 25% | 52% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 46% | 52% | 54% | 35% | 53% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 44% | 45% | 47% | 31% | 42% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 36% | 55% | 58% | 25% | 53% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 49% | 55% | 57% | 37% | 55% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 50% | 51% | 41% | 48% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 32% | 51% | 51% | 16% | 49% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 65% | 67% | 72% | 30% | 67% | 70% |

| EW: | S Indicators as In | put Earlier in th | e Survey | |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------------|----------|-------|
| Indicator | Grade L | evel (prior year re | eported) | Total |
| indicator | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| | (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 | 38% | 52% | -14% | 54% | -16% |
| | 2018 | 23% | 48% | -25% | 52% | -29% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 15% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 25% | 48% | -23% | 52% | -27% |
| | 2018 | 30% | 48% | -18% | 51% | -21% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | 2% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 32% | 54% | -22% | 56% | -24% |
| | 2018 | 34% | 55% | -21% | 58% | -24% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | 2% | | | | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|--------------|-----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 30% | 43% | -13% | 55% | -25% |
| | 2018 | 23% | 35% | -12% | 52% | -29% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 18% | 49% | -31% | 54% | -36% |
| | 2018 | 16% | 51% | -35% | 54% | -38% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | -5% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 24% | 36% | -12% | 46% | -22% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 32% | 7% | 45% | -6% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -15% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | 8% | | | | |

| | | | SCIENCE | | | |
|--------------|-----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 26% | 49% | -23% | 48% | -22% |
| | 2018 | 31% | 49% | -18% | 50% | -19% |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |

| | | BIOLO | GY EOC | | |
|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| | | CIVIC | S EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 64% | 66% | -2% | 71% | -7% |
| 2018 | 48% | 66% | -18% | 71% | -23% |
| | ompare | 16% | 1070 | 1 , , | |
| | 1 | | RY EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| <u> </u> | | ALGEB | RA EOC | ' | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 86% | 63% | 23% | 61% | 25% |
| 2018 | 61% | 61% | 0% | 62% | -1% |
| Co | ompare | 25% | | | |
| | | GEOME | TRY EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 100% | 53% | 47% | 57% | 43% |
| 2018 | 77% | 65% | 12% | 56% | 21% |
| Co | ompare | 23% | | | |

Subgroup Data

| | | 2019 | SCHO | DL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 | 24 | 39 | 34 | 18 | 38 | 35 | 26 | 31 | | | |
| ELL | 28 | 45 | 48 | 29 | 48 | 52 | 31 | 55 | 83 | | |
| BLK | 33 | 44 | 43 | 34 | 48 | 46 | 29 | 64 | 81 | | |
| HSP | 36 | 49 | 42 | 38 | 50 | 53 | 35 | 65 | 83 | | |
| WHT | 57 | 44 | | 52 | 46 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 34 | 46 | 46 | 36 | 49 | 50 | 34 | 63 | 83 | | |
| | | 2018 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 20 | 45 | 42 | 20 | 51 | 48 | 37 | 25 | | | |

| | | 2018 | SCHOO | DL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 |
| ELL | 18 | 45 | 42 | 19 | 41 | 48 | 20 | 42 | 50 | | |
| BLK | 30 | 51 | 57 | 31 | 45 | 48 | 35 | 47 | 56 | | |
| HSP | 35 | 51 | 40 | 38 | 49 | 59 | 43 | 56 | 62 | | |
| WHT | 36 | 46 | | 43 | 69 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 31 | 50 | 53 | 35 | 47 | 49 | 38 | 49 | 66 | | |
| | | 2017 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 2 | 19 | 16 | 2 | 27 | 40 | | 14 | | | |
| ELL | 14 | 30 | 25 | 17 | 36 | 36 | 4 | 19 | 54 | | |
| BLK | 21 | 31 | 32 | 24 | 37 | 38 | 14 | 29 | 48 | | |
| HSP | 33 | 46 | 26 | 27 | 37 | 50 | 18 | 28 | 38 | | |
| FRL | 22 | 31 | 29 | 24 | 37 | 42 | 16 | 26 | 49 | | |

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 | 48 |
| 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 | 41 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 478 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 31 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 46 |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 46 |
| 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 | 49 |
| 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 | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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 component with the lowest performance was ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains which went from a 53% in 2018 down to a 44% in 2019. Memorial overall improved in ELA with the exception of the Lowest 25%. Teacher's instructional capacity to deconstruct the standards into digestible bites for our lower students was the main contributing factor. Teachers were unable to differentiate and scaffold low enough to help the struggling students.

Since there was no FSA data for the 19-20 school year iReady data was considered. For the BOY 6th grade had 19% proficient, 24% bubble, and 57% below grade level. For the MOY 6th grade had 25% proficient, 24% bubble, and 51% below. For the BOY 7th grade had 21% proficient, 21% bubble, and 58% below grade level. For the MOY 7th grade had 33% proficient, 20% bubble, and 47% below. For the BOY 8th grade had 18% proficient, 15% bubble, and 67% below grade level. For the MOY 8th grade had 25% proficient, 19% bubble, and 56% below. All grade levels showed growth.

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

Science showed the greatest decline from a 38% in 2018 down to a 32% in 2019. Several factors contributed to this 6 percentage point decline. Memorial had 2 new Science teachers who lacked knowledge of the content standards and were unable to teach to the rigor of the standard. In addition, one of the teachers had medical issues that caused inconsistent delivery of the content to the students. PMA 3 data from 2020 was considered due to the lack of testing. PMA 3 data shows a 33% proficiency rate.

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 showed a 22% gap from the state average. Memorial had 36% Math proficiency and the state average was 58%. Although the Math Achievement increased by 2%, the teachers struggled with scaffolding and teaching to the rigor of the math standards. Since there was no FSA data for the 19-20 school year iReady data was considered. For the BOY 6th grade had 21% proficient, 37% bubble, and 42% below grade level. For the MOY 6th grade had 30% proficient, 35% bubble, and 35% below. For the BOY 7th grade had 3% proficient, 45% bubble, and 53% below grade level. For the MOY 7th grade had 14% proficient, 38% bubble, and 48% below. For the BOY 8th grade had 0% proficient, 18% bubble, and 82% below grade level. For the MOY 8th grade had 3% proficient, 21% bubble, and 76% below. 7th and 8th grade students in Algebra and Geometry did not take these assessments. All grade levels showed growth.

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

Middle School Acceleration increased by 24%, Memorial had 58% in 2018 and 82% in 2019. Memorial provided a support class to all students taking Algebra 1 Honors and Geometry honors. The support class provided more time for students to practice the prerequisite skills and receive a deeper understanding of the standards. In addition to the Algebra and Geometry support, Memorial had 9 students pass the Microsoft Certification exams in 2019 and 2 students pass in 2020. More students were unable to test due to digital learning.

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

The most important area for concern is the number of students scoring a level 1 on the FSA either in Math or Reading. Approximately half of Memorial's students score a level 1 on either the FSA Math or Reading. Memorial will increase the number of students taking Intensive Reading and Intensive Math, provide weekly tutoring in both Reading and Math, as well as provide Saturday School monthly for Reading, Math, Civics and Science. Another area of concern is the number of suspensions which totaled 225 in the 18/19 school year and 95 in the 19/20 school year. The 19/20 school year excludes 4th quarter. Memorial plans to expand the Positive Behavior Support program to include more consistent incentives and increase the number of students receiving mentoring and emotional support. Memorial also plans to increase the number of Restorative Justice circles/sessions in hopes of decreasing student conflicts which result in suspensions.

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

- 1. Increase ELA proficiency
- 2. Increase Math proficiency
- 3. Increase Learning Gains in both Reading and Math
- 4. Increase in Science proficiency
- 5. Sustain or Increase Civics, Algebra 1, and Geometry proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Memorial will increase proficiency and achievement in all subgroups by implementing differentiated instruction, as well as an intense focus on improving teacher instructional capacity with a deeper understanding of the Florida Standards.

Area of Focus

Description and

and Rationale:

Memorial will provide opportunities for minority students to take advanced and/or high school accelerated classes and provide support through tutoring and intervention classes to help ensure their success. In addition, Memorial will provide interventions to help struggling students be successful academically; such as Intensive Reading and Math classes for below proficiency students, tutoring after school, and Saturday tutoring. Administration will also work with teachers on increasing engagement, ensuring lessons meet the rigor of the standard, and providing support with classroom management.

Measurable Outcome:

The intended outcome is increased student proficiency and achievement for all students, while decreasing the achievement gap.

Person responsible

for

Kenisha Holmes (kenisha.holmes@ocps.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased Strategy: Analyze the achievement gap data by subgroups and create a list of students to monitor and provide interventions. In addition, identify students with potential for accelerated classes. Provide both academic and behavioral support, social emotional support, academic interventions, and opportunities for advanced course work.

Rationale

for Evidencebased

Strategy:

By targeting and monitoring the specific students within a subgroup, Memorial will provide

individual support and make immediate required adjustments.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. Collaborate with teachers and analyze state assessment data
- 2. Identify areas of weakness based on current data
- 3. Create an action plan based on data and areas of weakness
- 4. Implement the action plan
- 5. Monitor, review, and adjust the action plan based on current assessment data

Person Responsible

Kenisha Holmes (kenisha.holmes@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at Memorial with adults and students.

Area of Focus
Description

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:

and Rationale:

- Increase ELA and Math Learning Gains
 Increase ELA and Math proficiency
- 3. Increase Science proficiency
- 4. Strengthen teacher instructional capacity
- 5. Provide a safe, nurturing, structured learning environment for all students

Memorial Middle School will focus on the following data-based areas:

Measurable

- 1. Learning gains and proficiency on both district and state assessments.
- Outcome: 2. Improvement in all Early Warning Systems (EWS) indicator data

3. Cognia survey data

Person responsible

for monitoring outcome:

Kenisha Holmes (kenisha.holmes@ocps.net)

Evidencebased Strategy: Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Memorial will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. In addition, Memorial 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

Evidencebased 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. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model, Memorial will implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement strategies for social and emotional learning with adults and students to positively impact school climate and culture

Person Responsible

Kenisha Holmes (kenisha.holmes@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

Memorial has been focused on creating a positive school culture and environment through mentoring, community partnerships, and the use of Restorative Justice. The guidance counselors have been working with a group of minority female students to track their academics and behavior, as well as to create short and long term goals. My Brother's Keeper has partnered with the school to mentor minority male students each week. Memorial has also created the Latinos in Action class that focuses on building leaders on campus. Students have the opportunities to participate in Restorative Justice Circles/Sessions in order to help maintain a safe and positive school climate.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups | \$0.00 |
|---|--------|--|--------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | \$0.00 |
| | | Total: | \$0.00 |