

Alachua County Public Schools

Oak View Middle School



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	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

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

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 5-8
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)	50%
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: A (62%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 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.

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	24

Oak View Middle School

1203 SW 250TH ST, Newberry, FL 32669

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

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 5-8	No	63%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (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

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 5-8
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)	50%
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: A (62%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	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.
Measurable Outcome:	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.
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)

#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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	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%.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of African American Students at Oak View Middle School who pass the ELA and Math FSA will increase by 3%.
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	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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)

#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