

Alachua County Public Schools

# Oak View Middle School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>23</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>24</b> |

# Oak View Middle School

1203 SW 250TH ST, Newberry, FL 32669

<https://www.sbac.edu/oakview>

## Demographics

**Principal: Kelly Armstrong**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2020

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>5-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 50%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (62%)<br>2017-18: A (62%)<br>2016-17: B (60%)<br>2015-16: B (60%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I   |

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

## 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>24</b> |

## Oak View Middle School

1203 SW 250TH ST, Newberry, FL 32669

<https://www.sbac.edu/oakview>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School<br>5-8                             | No                     | 63%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 43%  |

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Oak View Middle School is to provide 21st century skills that will inspire lifelong learning and prepare our students to be literate and productive citizens.

The mission of the Center for Advanced Academics and Technology magnet at Oak View is to prepare students to become lifelong learners and achievers in sophisticated scholastic and technical arenas as they pursue their educational and professional goals in a digital age.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Oak View Middle School is a center of excellence where children can achieve full potential in their academic, technological, creative, personal and moral development in and outside the classroom.

### 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 |
|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Armstrong, Kelly         | Principal           |                                 |
| Sailor, Sharon           | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Lynch, Matt              | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Jones, Garrett           | Dean                |                                 |
| Campbell-Choice, Eugenia | Dean                |                                 |
| Scott, Bobbi             | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Caffrey, Ryan            | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Marlowe, Lauren          | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Flournoy, Ernestine      | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Merton, Karen            | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Whiddon, Danielle        | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Pirzer, Lori             | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Cantrell, Monica         | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Merz, Aaron              | School Counselor    |                                 |
| Kanji, Jill              | School Counselor    |                                 |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 6/3/2020, Kelly Armstrong

**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.*

2

**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.*

17

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

34

### Demographic Data

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>5-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 50%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (62%)<br>2017-18: A (62%)<br>2016-17: B (60%)<br>2015-16: B (60%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |



|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>Year</b>  |      |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |      |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> . |      |

## 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  | 249 | 247 | 240 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 736 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 12  | 31  | 22  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 76  |       |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 4   | 18  | 5   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 3   | 8   | 6   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17  |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 4   | 14  | 7   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 35  | 43  | 25  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 116 |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 43  | 43  | 28  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 132 |       |

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 | 12 | 27 | 42 | 24 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 105 |       |

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/11/2020

### 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 | 128 | 279 | 260 | 260 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 927 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11  | 21  | 30  | 36  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 98  |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 10  | 7   | 12  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 9   | 23  | 33  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 65  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38  | 66  | 42  | 66  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 212 |       |

**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 | 3 | 17 | 25 | 36 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 81 |       |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11 |       |

**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 | 128 | 279 | 260 | 260 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 927 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11  | 21  | 30  | 36  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 98  |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 10  | 7   | 12  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 9   | 23  | 33  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 65  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38  | 66  | 42  | 66  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 212 |       |

**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 | 3 | 17 | 25 | 36 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 81 |       |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11 |       |

## 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             | 64%    | 59%      | 54%   | 63%    | 60%      | 52%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 59%    | 56%      | 54%   | 58%    | 59%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 44%    | 41%      | 47%   | 38%    | 40%      | 44%   |
| Math Achievement            | 63%    | 60%      | 58%   | 64%    | 60%      | 56%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 60%    | 56%      | 57%   | 60%    | 62%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 41%    | 46%      | 51%   | 45%    | 47%      | 50%   |
| Science Achievement         | 60%    | 53%      | 51%   | 56%    | 57%      | 50%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 77%    | 73%      | 72%   | 79%    | 72%      | 70%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) |     |     |     | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|           | 5                                 | 6   | 7   | 8   |       |
|           | (0)                               | (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 |
| 05                    | 2019 | 56%    | 55%      | 1%                         | 56%   | 0%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 58%    | 55%      | 3%                         | 55%   | 3%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                    | 2019 | 67%    | 53%      | 14%                        | 54%   | 13%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 61%    | 55%      | 6%                         | 52%   | 9%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 9%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 64%    | 54%      | 10%                        | 52%   | 12%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 65%    | 55%      | 10%                        | 51%   | 14%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 64%    | 61%      | 3%                         | 56%   | 8%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 72%    | 61%      | 11%                        | 58%   | 14%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -8%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 56%    | 57%      | -1%                        | 60%   | -4%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 61%    | 61%      | 0%                         | 61%   | 0%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -5%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                    | 2019 | 61%    | 52%      | 9%                         | 55%   | 6%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 49%    | 53%      | -4%                        | 52%   | -3%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 12%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 63%    | 59%      | 4%                         | 54%   | 9%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 68%    | 58%      | 10%                        | 54%   | 14%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -5%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 14%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 24%    | 27%      | -3%                        | 46%   | -22%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 20%    | 24%      | -4%                        | 45%   | -25%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -44%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 54%    | 55%      | -1%                        | 53%   | 1%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 53%    | 55%      | -2%                        | 55%   | -2%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 62%    | 54%      | 8%                         | 48%   | 14%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 58%    | 53%      | 5%                         | 50%   | 8%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 9%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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        | 76%    | 69%      | 7%                    | 71%   | 5%                 |
| 2018        | 79%    | 69%      | 10%                   | 71%   | 8%                 |
| Compare     |        | -3%      |                       |       |                    |

| 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         | 92%    | 56%      | 36%                   | 61%   | 31%                |
| 2018         | 85%    | 60%      | 25%                   | 62%   | 23%                |
| Compare      |        | 7%       |                       |       |                    |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 100%   | 48%      | 52%                   | 57%   | 43%                |
| 2018         | 100%   | 63%      | 37%                   | 56%   | 44%                |
| Compare      |        | 0%       |                       |       |                    |

## 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                                       | 22       | 44     | 40          | 20        | 35      | 29           | 23       | 24      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 30       |        |             | 20        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 100      | 54     |             | 100       | 85      |              |          |         | 100       |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 26       | 39     | 34          | 26        | 39      | 32           | 25       | 55      | 82        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 58       | 59     | 68          | 56        | 55      | 40           | 54       | 75      | 87        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 56       | 52     | 29          | 60        | 55      | 19           | 55       | 74      | 85        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 74       | 65     | 46          | 73        | 65      | 51           | 70       | 84      | 89        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 42       | 47     | 39          | 39        | 44      | 36           | 40       | 62      | 78        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 24       | 33     | 24          | 19        | 33      | 29           | 19       | 32      |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 100      | 93     |             | 100       | 93      |              |          |         | 90        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 34       | 52     | 53          | 28        | 41      | 35           | 36       | 44      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 67       | 62     | 37          | 61        | 59      | 53           | 54       | 79      | 75        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 68       | 57     | 40          | 66        | 52      | 21           | 52       | 72      | 92        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 71       | 66     | 48          | 69        | 62      | 44           | 62       | 91      | 85        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 45       | 54     | 48          | 43        | 46      | 37           | 40       | 65      | 71        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 24       | 35     | 31          | 28        | 43      | 41           | 15       | 55      |           |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| ASN                                       | 100      | 73     |             | 100       | 82      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 30       | 47     | 38          | 25        | 40      | 35           | 25       | 48      | 55        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 60       | 53     | 55          | 66        | 65      | 65           | 55       | 94      | 88        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 60       | 61     | 40          | 60        | 45      |              | 55       | 83      |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 71       | 61     | 34          | 73        | 65      | 48           | 64       | 83      | 75        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 42       | 49     | 35          | 45        | 50      | 42           | 36       | 62      | 60        |                   |                     |

### 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  | 62   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 3    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |      |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 557  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 9    |
| Percent Tested  | 98%  |
| 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                                       | 25   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 1    |
| Native American Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Native American Students  |      |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%         | 0    |

| Asian Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Asian Students   | 88  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                    | 40  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 61  |
| 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   | 54  |
| 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   | 69  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 47  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

## Analysis

**Data Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

At Oak View Middle School, the group with the lowest performance are our Students with Disabilities. This has historically been the case, in large part due to the challenges of providing differentiated instruction and accommodations to meet the needs of these diverse learners.

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

Two areas showed the greatest declines from previous years. Our Civics achievement dropped by 4%. This was likely due to the fact that one of our two civics instructors was out for half of the year, and the class was taught by several long term subs. Although extremely helpful in providing instruction to our students, the very high bar set by our more experienced, certified teachers was difficult to attain.

The other area of greatest decline was our ELA gains. The previous school year had seen a large jump in gains scores, particularly in the 8th grade cohort that moved on to high school. The reduction brought us back closer to the ELA gains of the previous years.

**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.**

The largest gap between our school and the state average was in our lowest quartile math gains. As a school, we have historically underperformed compared to the state when comparing the bottom quartile. Our ELA bottom quartile gains are 5% lower than the state average, and in math is double that at 10% below state average. Meanwhile, our achievement in both areas is well above state average.

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

The area of largest increase was in our Science achievement scores. The primary change made during the previous school year related to science was a major overhaul of how our school ran science fair. During previous years, every student would complete a science fair project, and the class time allocated to the fair and its projects was significant. Last year, the school adopted an optional science fair model in which the vast majority of work was completed outside of class. This meant that teachers had more instructional time available for teaching important science content.

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

Our main indicator of concern is the number of students with an achievement level of 1. This indicator impacts the most number of students by far. Beyond the individual indicators, we are also especially concerned with those students who display 2 or more of the indicators, as they are at an even higher risk of not being successful.

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

1. Increase Achievement of Students with Disabilities
2. Increase Lowest Quartile ELA and Math Gains
3. Decrease the achievement gap between White and Black students, by increasing African American Achievement in ELA and Math.



4. Increase Achievement of ELL students
5. Decrease African American Suspensions

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Students in our bottom quartile represent the students who are currently the farthest away from being successful on the ELA FSA. In order for these students to reach expectations, growth must be made on an annual basis. We will monitor and seek to improve in this area in order to have a school where all students are successful.                            |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Increase Learning Gains for the bottom quartile in ELA to 49%. This represents a 5% increase from the most recent test scores available, and a 1% increase from our 3 year high of 48% in 2017.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Reteaching and remediation informed by standards-based formative assessment data: Areas of deficiency will be identified using ongoing, formative assessments. Data from these assessments will be used to drive instruction in the areas of greatest need.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Due to the instructional time lost at the end of the 19-20 school year, combined with the high variability in instruction during the last 9 weeks of last school year, using formative assessment data to inform instruction will be more important than ever. Oak View will utilize district provided assessments, in order to identify areas of gaps in knowledge. |

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Assess students using district formative assessments.
2. Support/Train teachers in accessing relevant data
3. Support/Train teachers in creating lessons that directly impact areas of greatest concern.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Students in our bottom quartile represent the students who are currently the furthest away from being successful on the MATH FSA. In order for these students to reach expectations, growth must be made on an annual basis. We will monitor and seek to improve in this area in order to have a school where all students are successful.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase Learning Gains for the bottom quartile in MATH to 46%. This represents a 5% increase from the most recent test scores available, and a 1% increase from our 3 year high of 45% in 2017.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Reteaching and remediation informed by standards-based formative assessment data: Areas of deficiency will be identified using ongoing, formative assessments. Data from these assessments will be used to drive instruction in the areas of greatest need.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Due to the instructional time lost at the end of the 19-20 school year, combined with the high variability in instruction during the last 9 weeks of last school year, using formative assessment data to inform instruction will be more important than ever. Oak View will utilize district provided assessments, in order to identify areas of gaps in knowledge.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Assess students using district formative assessments.
2. Support/Train teachers in accessing relevant data
3. Support/Train teachers in creating lessons that directly impact areas of greatest concern.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | African American students at Oak View have consistently under-performed on the FSA, compared to their peers. Specifically, the achievement gap between African American students and their White peers is on the ELA FSA is 48%. For the Math FSA, that gap is 47%.  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>  | The percentage of African American Students at Oak View Middle School who pass the ELA and Math FSA will increase by 3%.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>   | Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>   | Reteaching and remediation informed by standards-based formative assessment data: Areas of deficiency will be identified using ongoing, formative assessments. Data from these assessments will be used to drive instruction in the areas of greatest need.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>   | Due to the instructional time lost at the end of the 19-20 school year, combined with the high variability in instruction during the last 9 weeks of last school year, using formative assessment data to inform instruction will be more important than ever. Oak View will utilize district provided assessments, in order to identify areas of gaps in knowledge. |
| <b>Action Steps to Implement</b>  |  |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assess students using district formative assessments.</li> <li>2. Support/Train teachers in accessing relevant data</li> <li>3. Support/Train teachers in creating lessons that directly impact areas of greatest concern.</li> </ol> |  |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>   | Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)  |

**#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** Students with disabilities are currently under performing as compared to their non-ESE peers. Oak View must use all tools necessary to reach these students, who represent the lowest performing group on campus.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase the academic performance of students with disabilities to meet or exceed the ESSA subgroupd target federal index rating of 41%

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Reteaching and remediation informed by standards-based formative assessment data: Areas of deficiency will be identified using ongoing, formative assessments. Data from these assessments will be used to drive instruction in the areas of greatest need.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Over the last two summers, we have worked with district ESE specialists to determine the best placement for students using the flexible scheduling method. The goal of these sessions has been to get students into the LRE where they will have the best opportunity to be successful.

Now that these students are in the LRE, training will be offered to support teacher in offering learning experiences that are accessible to all learners via the UDL training.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Flexible Scheduling
2. Assess students using district formative assessments.
3. Support/Train teachers in accessing relevant data
4. Support/Train teachers in creating lessons that directly impact areas of greatest concern.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)

**#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

ELL proficiency is our lowest subgroup at only 25% proficiency based on the ESSA formula.

**Measurable Outcome:**

ELL proficiency will increase as indicated on the federal report card by 5%. Our goal is to increase the overall academic performance of students in the ELL subgroup to meet or exceed the ESSA federal index target of 41%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Reteaching and remediation informed by standards-based formative assessment data: Areas of deficiency will be identified using ongoing, formative assessments. Data from these assessments will be used to drive instruction in the areas of greatest need. Ensure ESOL certified teachers are providing instruction for ELL students. The school will offer 2 parent nights for parents of ELL students. During these meetings, we will also meet with the parent leadership council.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

It is imperative that our ELL students receive our most highly qualified teachers who are ESOL endorsed, and capable of providing the differentiated instruction that ELL students need in order to be successful. In addition, culturally responsive classrooms will improve the learning environment for a diverse group of ELL students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Scheduling to ensure ESOL endorsed teachers are teaching ELL students
2. Culturally responsive classroom training
3. Assess students using district formative assessments.
4. Support/Train teachers in accessing relevant data
5. Support/Train teachers in creating lessons that directly impact areas of greatest concern.

**Person Responsible**

Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)

**#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** Historically, African American students have participated in advanced and accelerated coursework at a lower rate than their peers. Opportunities must exist for all students to access that will prepare them for advanced coursework, and ultimately college and career.

**Measurable Outcome:** Oak View will increase the percentage of African American students participating in accelerated coursework by 2%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** At the end of each year, students are identified for potential placement in advanced coursework based on FSA scores, as well as teacher recommendations. In addition, African American students are also targeted during the magnet selection process, with the goal of having magnet program demographics that mirror the school as a whole.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Enrollment in advanced coursework is primarily at the discretion of the school/teachers at the school, who recommend students for advanced coursework. To eliminate potential bias, student data is used as the primary identifier for who will be registered for advanced coursework. Once students are placed in these classes, supports are available to ensure success.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Review data to identify candidates for advanced coursework
2. Explicit communication of high expectations for all students
3. Use varied, effective strategies to instruct diverse learners

**Person Responsible** Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)

**#7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** African American students are suspended at a disproportionately higher rate than their peers of any other race. Suspensions lead to lost instructional time and lost learning. We aim to decrease the number of suspensions by reducing the infractions and behaviors that lead to suspensions.

**Measurable Outcome:** We will decrease the number of suspensions given for African American students by 15%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Implementation of PBIS  
Development and use of discipline matrix  
Use of Restorative practices

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Our primary goal is to reduce the behaviors that lead to suspensions. PBIS will support us in our efforts to explicitly teach behaviors that are appropriate for the school environment, and reward those positive behaviors. When negative behaviors do occur, it is important that we attempt to implement more restorative rather than punitive consequences.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Continue implementation of PBIS
2. Development of discipline matrix
3. Continued use of restorative practices
4. Training on restorative practices

**Person Responsible** Kelly Armstrong (armstrongkb@gm.sbac.edu)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Due to these unprecedented times, Oak View will focus on the basic principals of using multiple, formative assessments throughout the year, and capitalizing on this data by instructing students in the specific areas in which they need more support. This year will be unlike any other before. We will focus on collecting quality data, and intervening with students based on that data. While simple, this is far from easy. In this current environment, we must work hard to identify the needs of all students and provide them the quality instruction they need in order to be successful.**

**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.

At Oak View Middle School, a positive school culture begins with a staff who are committed to creating a positive school community. While all staff play a crucial role in building this culture, teachers are on the front lines with students every day. For our school, this means that all staff are annually trained in what it means to be a PBIS school. This ensures that every teacher is using the same terminology, and the same philosophy of rewarding the positive behaviors from every student across campus.

In addition to being a PBIS school, creating a positive school environment for teachers to work within is a focus of the administration at the school. This starts at the top, with the principal. Focused efforts are made throughout the school year to support staff and to improve morale.

For the last several years, Oak View has also attempted to engage families where they are. This means maintaining several social media platforms in addition to regular email updates. This allows the school to create a public profile that highlights the good things happening on campus. Followers on these platforms continue to increase each year, furthering our reach annually.

As for the community at large, the school annually seeks out support from a variety of community members. This primarily takes the form of our SAC committee, PTO, and on-campus mentors.

### 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 |                               |                |     | \$0.00     |
| 2 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction |                               |                |     | \$0.00     |
| 3 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American                       |                               |                |     | \$0.00     |
| 4 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities             |                               |                |     | \$0.00     |
| 5 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners              |                               |                |     | \$0.00     |
| 6 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity             |                               |                |     | \$0.00     |
| 7 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline                     |                               |                |     | \$4,250.00 |
|   | Function | Object  | Budget Focus                  | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21    |
|   |          |   | 0591 - Oak View Middle School |                |     | \$4,250.00 |



|        |   |  |            |
|--------|---|--|------------|
|        | Notes: HERO Software to support PBIS Implementation |  |            |
| Total: |   |  | \$4,250.00 |