

Orange County Public Schools

Freedom Middle



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Freedom Middle

2850 TAFT VINELAND RD, Orlando, FL 32837

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

Demographics

Principal: Robert Walker

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2015

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 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) | 92% |
| 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 (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (59%) |
| 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Freedom Middle

2850 TAFT VINELAND RD, Orlando, FL 32837

<https://freedomms.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 | 68% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 85% |

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.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

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 |
|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Leavitt, Cheri | Principal | Responsible for the academic needs and learning, social-emotional needs, and safety of all on campus |
| Cruz, Agnes | Assistant Principal | Assist the principal with the academic needs and learning, social-emotional needs, and safety of all on campus. |
| Brown, Denine | Assistant Principal | Assist the principal with the academic needs and learning, social-emotional needs, and safety of all on campus. |
| Robinson Taylor, Roxann | Dean | Responsible for the safety of all students on campus |
| Howland, Patrick | Other | Responsible for new teacher mentoring and coordinating all district and state testing |
| Leach, Renee | Other | Responsible for providing support to teachers in the areas of Florida Standards implementation, lesson planning, creation of common assessments, and differentiated instruction |
| Storms, Jacqueline | Other | Responsible for implementing Threat Response Protocols and serves as our community resource liaison and Interventions, Mental Health designee |
| Ross, Shannon | Dean | Responsible for the safety of all students on campus |
| Bonilla, Maria | Other | Responsible for all federal, state, and district mandates governing the education of our English language learners (ELLs) |
| Escanellas, Mariedith | Dean | Responsible for the safety of all students on campus |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/15/2015, Robert Walker

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.*

1

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

76

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) | 92% |
| 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 (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (59%) |
| 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 | 387 | 379 | 403 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1169 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 56 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 173 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 38 | 140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 78 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 228 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 79 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 285 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 81 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 | |

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 | 81 | 94 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 338 | |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/22/2020

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 | 445 | 490 | 471 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1406 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 73 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 243 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 72 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 79 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 232 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 | 220 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 575 | |

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 | 122 | 117 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 345 | |

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 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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 | 445 | 490 | 471 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1406 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 73 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 243 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 72 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 79 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 232 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 | 220 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 575 |

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 | 122 | 117 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 345 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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 | 47% | 52% | 54% | 58% | 52% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 48% | 52% | 54% | 59% | 53% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 39% | 45% | 47% | 51% | 42% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 53% | 55% | 58% | 59% | 53% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 54% | 55% | 57% | 56% | 55% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 56% | 50% | 51% | 43% | 48% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 53% | 51% | 51% | 45% | 49% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 61% | 67% | 72% | 70% | 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 | 40% | 52% | -12% | 54% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 38% | 48% | -10% | 52% | -14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 35% | 48% | -13% | 52% | -17% |
| | 2018 | 48% | 48% | 0% | 51% | -3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 42% | 54% | -12% | 56% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 42% | 55% | -13% | 58% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 39% | 43% | -4% | 55% | -16% |
| | 2018 | 31% | 35% | -4% | 52% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 40% | 49% | -9% | 54% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 51% | -4% | 54% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 21% | 36% | -15% | 46% | -25% |
| | 2018 | 32% | 32% | 0% | 45% | -13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -26% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 43% | 49% | -6% | 48% | -5% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 31% | 49% | -18% | 50% | -19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 12% | | | | |
| 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 | 54% | 66% | -12% | 71% | -17% |
| 2018 | 54% | 66% | -12% | 71% | -17% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |
| 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 | 74% | 63% | 11% | 61% | 13% |
| 2018 | 77% | 61% | 16% | 62% | 15% |
| Compare | | -3% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 94% | 53% | 41% | 57% | 37% |
| 2018 | 76% | 65% | 11% | 56% | 20% |
| Compare | | 18% | | | |

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 | 16 | 29 | 17 | 21 | 43 | 38 | 25 | 38 | | | |
| ELL | 30 | 47 | 41 | 40 | 52 | 51 | 33 | 45 | 72 | | |

| 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 | 78 | 62 | | 70 | 55 | | 72 | 88 | 84 | | |
| BLK | 40 | 44 | 28 | 46 | 48 | 57 | 33 | 57 | 84 | | |
| HSP | 42 | 47 | 41 | 49 | 54 | 55 | 49 | 59 | 76 | | |
| MUL | 45 | 36 | | 64 | 55 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | 48 | 35 | 66 | 57 | 68 | 68 | 69 | 88 | | |
| FRL | 43 | 45 | 36 | 50 | 52 | 55 | 48 | 54 | 79 | | |
| 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 | 16 | 42 | 44 | 28 | 48 | 51 | 21 | 26 | 70 | | |
| ELL | 25 | 46 | 48 | 37 | 64 | 60 | 16 | 42 | 81 | | |
| ASN | 81 | 68 | | 91 | 74 | | 74 | 84 | 100 | | |
| BLK | 43 | 42 | 46 | 45 | 50 | 48 | 32 | 57 | 65 | | |
| HSP | 46 | 47 | 44 | 52 | 56 | 59 | 32 | 69 | 76 | | |
| MUL | 71 | 53 | | 63 | 60 | | 60 | | 83 | | |
| WHT | 63 | 57 | 65 | 66 | 59 | 60 | 42 | 67 | 74 | | |
| FRL | 52 | 50 | 47 | 57 | 57 | 58 | 38 | 68 | 76 | | |
| 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 | 14 | 39 | 37 | 27 | 37 | 30 | 13 | 44 | | | |
| ELL | 29 | 54 | 52 | 35 | 48 | 35 | 11 | 38 | 71 | | |
| ASN | 80 | 76 | | 83 | 75 | | 67 | 90 | 97 | | |
| BLK | 49 | 54 | 33 | 48 | 53 | 44 | 41 | 75 | 94 | | |
| HSP | 55 | 58 | 51 | 54 | 53 | 38 | 39 | 65 | 80 | | |
| MUL | 79 | 71 | | 83 | 61 | | | 82 | 100 | | |
| WHT | 65 | 60 | 56 | 71 | 64 | 68 | 58 | 70 | 87 | | |
| FRL | 58 | 59 | 51 | 59 | 56 | 43 | 45 | 70 | 85 | | |

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 | 56 |
| 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 | 558 |
| 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% | 1 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 48 |
| 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 | 73 |
| 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 | 49 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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 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 | 60 |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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.

8th Grade Mathematics and 7th Grade FSA ELA in the lowest quartile showed the lowest performance. contributing factors for math include the placement of all Level 3s (as indicated on the 7th grade Math FSA) in Algebra I Honors. Improved professional development is needed for the 8th-grade teachers in scaffolding, creating hands-on learning experiences, and effective use of math vocabulary strategies. Contributing factors for ELA include the lack of school-wide high yield literacy strategies, including effective vocabulary instruction strategies, and support for the development of print-rich physical or digital classroom environments to support English language acquisition.

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

FSA ELA learning gains in the lowest 25% showed the greatest decline. Contributing factors included lack of school-wide high yield literacy strategies, including effective vocabulary instruction strategies, and support for the development of print-rich physical or digital classroom environments to support English language acquisition.

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.

8th Grade Mathematics showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Contributing factors for math include the placement of all Level 3s (as indicated on the 7th grade Math FSA) in Algebra I Honors. Improved professional development is needed for the 8th-grade teachers in scaffolding, creating hands-on learning experiences, and effective use of math vocabulary strategies.

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

Science achievement showed the most improvement due to increased collaboration through release days and, data-driven instruction using Progress Monitoring Assessments (PMA) data which identified gaps from the prior year. Lessons were developed and implemented to address the gaps in learning. Team teaching was implemented to support the students with current and prior standards.

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

The greatest area of concern is the number of students with two or more indicators.

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

1. School-Wide High Yield Literacy Strategies
2. Culturally Responsive Practices
3. School-Wide Writing Strategies
4. Collaborative Planning
5. Professional Learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement**Areas of Focus:**

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

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Continued examination of strategies needed to narrow the achievement gap observed among students from diverse backgrounds by providing professional learning and support to instructional staff. In addition, to include the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) model with staff development focused on the Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Competencies, which are self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Instructional staff will increase their understanding, engagement, and implementation of standards-based instruction to support English Language Learners by providing high-yield instructional strategies that support learning and narrow the achievement gap by providing opportunities to participate in professional development. Modifications to instructional practice will be measured through formative assessments. (Division Priority #1: Accelerate Student Performance, Division Priority #2: Invest in Human Capital) |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Cheri Leavitt (cheri.godek@ocps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Academic vocabulary will be front-loaded and cognates will be used to develop comprehension. Such teacher evidence may include word walls or charts either in the physical or digital classroom. Student evidence includes being able to demonstrate an understanding of the content through verbal or written response. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Teachers struggle with the utilization of high yield strategies developed to increase learning gains of English language learners (ELLs). |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will receive staff development on how to incorporate high-yield strategies for academic vocabulary acquisition for English Language Learners (ELLs) across the content areas.

Person Responsible Maria Bonilla (maria.bonilla@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Using an emphasis on standards-aligned instruction for continued understanding and implementation of curriculum facilitated collaborative planning through choosing appropriate content specific complex texts and school-wide writing strategies across all content areas. In addition, to include the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) model with staff development focused on the Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Competencies, which are self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Instructional and administrative staff will increase their knowledge, understanding, and reinforcement of curriculum facilitated collaborative planning through choosing appropriate content specific complex texts and assign standards-aligned writing tasks. Modifications to instructional practice will be measured through formative assessments. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Cheri Leavitt (cheri.godek@ocps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Academic vocabulary is displayed to develop comprehension. Such teacher evidence may include word walls or charts either in the physical or digital classroom. Student evidence includes signs of annotating the text. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Teachers struggle with recognizing how the Literary Evidences are implemented in planning and classroom instruction. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. The Leadership team will meet weekly to share progress reports, observations, commendations, and recommendations as observed by visiting classrooms and attending content collaboration.
2. Follow-up instructional coaching will be provided to individual teachers or departments as needed.

Person Responsible Cheri Leavitt (cheri.godek@ocps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Area of Focus | Research shows that students who participate in the arts do better academically. We have scheduled our self-contained students into music and art weekly and will look at and monitor their academic progress. |
| Description and Rationale: | |
| Measurable Outcome: | Our goal is to schedule our self-contained students into targeted fine arts elective classes in order for those students to improve academically. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Cheri Leavitt (cheri.godek@ocps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | We will be monitoring their academic progress as well as provide support in those targeted classrooms as needed. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Administrators and resource personnel will regularly review student performance data to look for evidence of an increase in student achievement using data from assessments and grade reports. In addition, administrators and resource personnel will meet to discuss the targeted students to determine any adjustments needed in our support program. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administrators will provide professional development on the protocol for monitoring academic progress at the beginning of the school year
2. Administrators will identify teachers that need additional support with progress monitoring and provide observations to better support this specified group.

Person Responsible Cheri Leavitt (cheri.godek@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.

The guidance department provides comprehensive guidance services to all students at Freedom Middle School via a needs assessment completed by every student during the first grading period of each school year. The guidance counselors provide small group and one-on-one counseling for a variety of student needs based on the results of the needs assessment. Services identified from the needs assessment may include but are not limited

to grief, divorce, depression, and social skills. The guidance department partners with SEDNET agencies to provide support in the home environment as well as at school. Additional school resource personnel such as the school social worker, school psychologist, and school resource officer are all part of the school team which addresses the social and emotional needs of all students.

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 | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |