Orange Grove Middle Magnet School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Orange Grove Middle Magnet School

3415 N 16TH ST, Tampa, FL 33605

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michael M IR Anda

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2006

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Orange Grove Middle Magnet School

3415 N 16TH ST, Tampa, FL 33605

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	81%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Orange Grove Middle Magnet School of the Arts, success is the expectation. We seek to empower well-rounded individuals through all disciplines. We will create a community of respect and sensitivity while fostering an appreciation of the role of Arts in life. We will accomplish our Vision by:

* Maintaining a standard of excellence for every student
* Broadening student experiences in Arts and Academics
* Promoting a creative and artistic approach to learning
* Fostering a creative, cooperative environment
* Providing experience and training in all content areas that goes beyond what is offered in traditional middle school curriculum
* Encouraging active involvement of students, parents, and the community
* Embracing the critical role we play in the K-12 Fine Arts Program

This will empower students to become respectful, successful, lifelong learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Orange Grove is to prepare every student to be successful and creative by promoting high academic standards through an arts integrated approach to learning.

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
Fleischmann, Adam	Assistant Principal	School leader, assistant principal.
Miranda, Michael	Principal	Develops and monitors all SIP areas to improve student achievement outcomes. Consults with various stakeholders to share progress towards SIP goals and modify the plan as needed throughout the school year.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/23/2006, Michael M IR Anda

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.*
12

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.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	200	168	151	0	0	0	0	519
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	5	0	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	32	55	0	0	0	0	141
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	10	8	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	8	8	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	29	21	0	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	43	26	0	0	0	0	132

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	15	0	0	0	0	28

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	0	0	0	0	0	19

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/31/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	179	154	175	0	0	0	0	508
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	19	15	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	179	154	175	0	0	0	0	508
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	19	15	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5	0	0	0	0	18

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	53%	51%	54%	55%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	52%	54%	57%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	47%	47%	41%	45%	44%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	49%	55%	58%	48%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	55%	57%	57%	51%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	52%	51%	42%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	41%	47%	51%	47%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	52%	67%	72%	69%	66%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	52%	53%	-1%	54%	-2%
	2018	51%	52%	-1%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	55%	54%	1%	52%	3%
	2018	62%	52%	10%	51%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	53%	53%	0%	56%	-3%
	2018	58%	54%	4%	58%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	39%	49%	-10%	55%	-16%
	2018	41%	48%	-7%	52%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	56%	62%	-6%	54%	2%
	2018	56%	61%	-5%	54%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
08	2019	25%	31%	-6%	46%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	26%	29%	-3%	45%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	41%	47%	-6%	48%	-7%
	2018	46%	48%	-2%	50%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	52%	67%	-15%	71%	-19%
2018	64%	65%	-1%	71%	-7%
Compare	-12%				
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	85%	63%	22%	61%	24%
2018	93%	63%	30%	62%	31%
Compare	-8%				
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%
2018					

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	11	19	20	17	35	27	12	25			
ELL	32	28	25	17	42						
BLK	36	40	38	34	48	45	19	43	72		
HSP	58	52	44	53	58	48	44	58	64		
MUL	50	44		61	67		50				
WHT	80	62	54	69	60	43	74	68	92		
FRL	44	45	36	41	53	47	26	48	68		
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	17	51	52	19	37	35	18	21			
ELL	35	43	36	22	48	44					
BLK	41	48	43	36	47	46	27	50	83		
HSP	64	56	50	56	62	58	38	69	95		
MUL	63	63		52	39			60			
WHT	74	65	25	72	66	59	72	82	85		
FRL	50	52	44	44	51	48	38	54	83		
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	12	34	31	12	31	29	8	33			
ELL	17	33	30	9	23	29					
ASN	75	64		83	64						
BLK	37	43	35	29	41	42	23	54	59		
HSP	55	61	53	46	45	33	52	73	79		
MUL	71	71		67	67						
WHT	79	73	45	72	69	67	64	83	90		
FRL	46	52	38	37	45	37	33	63	72		

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	465

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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	24
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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

Multiracial Students	
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	67
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	45
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.

ELA bottom quartile. Teacher experience, teacher effectiveness, and classroom management.

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

Social studies (Civics) achievement: 64%-52%. Teacher effectiveness and lack of common assessments and progress monitoring.

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.

Social studies (Civics) achievement: 20 pts. Teacher effectiveness and lack of common assessments and progress monitoring.

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

None. Math learning gains stayed the same. N/A.

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

SWD and ELL subgroups. We haven't had these positions fully staffed in over three years, relying on long-term subs.

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

1. Bottom quartile gains in reading
2. Bottom quartile gains in math
3. Proficiency for SWD in reading and math
4. Civics
5. Close achievement gap in ELA and Math between white students and black an Hispanic counterparts

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reading & Writing learning gains and math learning gains for all students, including SWD and ELL students, and with an emphasis on the bottom quartile. For the first, students are not going into the text and pulling out evidence to support their claims. In math, teachers are not differentiating instruction for all students to show mastery of concepts, and students are unable to unpack the real world math word problems applied to the math Standards.
Measurable Outcome:	Increased learning gains for all students in reading, writing, and math scores from previous statewide and/or district assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Adam Fleischmann (adam.fleischmann@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers being trained in the writing process and students given time to practice going back into the text to provide evidence for their answers. Teacher planning incorporating the depth of questioning and discussion and collective efficacy principles. Teachers incorporate more activities (especially hands-on) to specifically address Standards where students are struggling, more meaningful open-ended questions and genuine discussion, use math vocabulary consistently in instruction, utilize ongoing formative assessment, and differentiate instruction for all students depending on mastery of concept(s).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers not revisiting and teaching to the Standards that students missed on assessments. Teachers not having enough time to review key concepts and close gaps in instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We have replaced less than effective teachers with highly effective teachers, filled both V.E./ESE positions, hired a success coach, made changes to 2 of 4 SAL's, provided ongoing PD for all teachers.

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 Orange Grove Middle Magnet, we involve teachers, staff, parents, and students to include everyone in the planning and implementation of school-wide events. This includes: Black History Showcase, Hispanic Heritage Showcase, Veterans' Day Assembly, spring play/musical, scream the theme parade/fall festival, winter wahoo, grade level incentive field trips, awards ceremonies, 8th grade banquet, rising star cafe's, Night of Stars talent show, etc. Every student is a "STAR", both inside and outside the classroom. Our theme of the visual, communication, and performing arts helps unify our students and staff, and the arts integration helps promote engagement inside the classrooms. We recognize students and staff who "shine" with award certificates, trophies, lunches, t-shirts, being able to attend certain school-wide events, and shout-outs on the intercom and morning show. We have a mentoring program, Girl Scouts meet once/week on campus, a rock band club, extramural sports, NJHS, as well as several student groups who rehearse and practice after school and perform inside and outside the district.

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: Differentiation	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00