

Orange County Public Schools

Magnolia School



2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| R.A.I.S.E | 0 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |

Magnolia School

1900 MATTERHORNE DR, Orlando, FL 32818

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

Demographics

Principal: Timothy Shuler

Start Date for this Principal: 3/13/2019

| | |
|--|--|
| 2021-22 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Function (per accountability file) | ESE |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School PK-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Special Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 79% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Improvement Rating History | 2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Maintaining 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: No Rating |
| DJJ Accountability Rating | 2023-24: No Rating |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

All students attending Magnolia School present with a significant disability ranging from medical and physical abnormalities to significant cognitive disabilities. The primary goal is to lead students to their highest level of independence regarding their education, employment, and community involvement, in order to enhance their quality of life. The chief focus is to provide the necessary supports which will enable each student with a significant disability the opportunity to receive a high school diploma and become college and career ready.

Services are individualized based upon student needs and include instruction in the Florida Standards Access Points for English Language Arts, Mathematics and Next Generation Sunshine Standards for Science and Social Studies. In addition, life skills related to independent functioning, social/emotional behavior, communication and related services such as physical and /or occupational therapy, nursing and specialized transportation are also provided to students as needed.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Green, Latonia | Principal | The Principal is responsible for the overall operation of the school. Some of these operations include: being an instructional leader, hiring effective faculty and staff, providing teachers with actionable feedback to improve instructional pedagogy, creating a safe and positive school culture, supervising and evaluating faculty and staff, maintaining secure funding for the school, and conduct meetings to create academic action plans to address student needs and improve student achievement school-wide. |
| Lee, Wendy | Assistant Principal | To assist the Principal in coordinating, providing leadership and making available desired expertise that are needed. Observes instructional delivery, provides teachers with actionable feedback, participates in common planning, assist with professional development. |
| Thomson, Arlene | Assistant Principal | To assist the Principal in coordinating, providing leadership and making available desired expertise that are needed. Observes instructional delivery, provides teachers with actionable feedback, participates in common planning, assist with professional development. |
| Dunn, Jessica | Other | Monitor and support students who demonstrate social and emotional needs. Participate in the development of behavior plans for specific students and collect data on behavioral trends, while also monitoring and supporting the school wide behavior management plan. Additionally, they will communicate with parents and provide resources for families in need of support. |
| Adkins, Joshua | Curriculum Resource Teacher | Provide individual and group professional development that expand and refine the understanding of effective instruction. In order to meet this purpose, instructional coaches provide personalized support, through the utilization of the coaching cycle (e.g. coaching, modeling, observation, conferencing, etc.) that is based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers and administrators. Instructional coaches provide support in analyzing student assessment data and making instructional decisions based on student need. |
| Garcia, Arlene | Instructional Coach | Provide individual and group professional development that expand and refine the understanding of effective instruction. In order to meet this purpose, instructional coaches provide personalized support, through the utilization of the coaching cycle (e.g. coaching, modeling, observation, conferencing, etc.) that is based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers and administrators. Instructional coaches provide |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------|----------------------------|---|
| | | support in analyzing student assessment data and making instructional decisions based on student need. |
| Hogan, Andrea | Other | Work with teachers to support best practices in using data, make recommendations about potential next steps to address areas of need, and analyze school-wide trends in Math and Science instruction. She takes a direct approach as an instructional leader to improve instruction and productivity by working to increase the effectiveness of Math and Science instruction. This includes modeling lessons, helping teachers plan instruction, and facilitating professional development. Engages stakeholders through the implementation of school and district-wide STEaM initiatives. |
| Gomez, Candace | Other | Monitor and support students who demonstrate social and emotional needs. Participate in the development of behavior plans for specific students and collect data on behavioral trends, while also monitoring and supporting the school wide behavior management plan. Additionally, they will communicate with parents and provide resources for families in need of support. |
| Allen, Whitney | Attendance/ Social Work | Monitor and support students who demonstrate social and emotional needs. Communicate with parents and provide resources for families in need of support. |
| Wooten, Lorna | Staffing Specialist | Work with the faculty to ensure the school is in compliance with the ESE policies and procedures in relation to students with exceptionalities and disabilities. Works collaboratively with both ESE and general education teachers to ensure all students are academically successful. This is accomplished through ongoing professional learning communities, professional development, and meetings providing the most up to date federal, state and OCPS mandates. |
| Hicks, Alida | Instructional Coach | Provide individual and group professional development that expand and refine the understanding of effective instruction. In order to meet this purpose, instructional coaches provide personalized support, through the utilization of the coaching cycle (e.g. coaching, modeling, observation, conferencing, etc.) that is based on the goals and identified needs of individual teachers and administrators. Instructional coaches provide support in analyzing student assessment data and making instructional decisions based on student need. |

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

Demographic Information**Principal start date**

Wednesday 3/13/2019, Timothy Shuler

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

29

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

103

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

2

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 12 | 3 | 11 | 35 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 19 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 9 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 8 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 8 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 12 | |

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 | |
| 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 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/16/2021

2020-21 - 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 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 9 | 15 | 43 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 10 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 12 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 |

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 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 13 |

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 Review**

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 | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | | 62% | 61% | | 60% | 60% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | | 60% | 59% | | 57% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 55% | 54% | | 54% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | | | | | 61% | 62% | | 60% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | | 60% | 59% | | 60% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 54% | 52% | | 55% | 52% |
| Science Achievement | | | | | 56% | 56% | | 56% | 57% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | | 74% | 78% | | 74% | 77% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 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 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 18 | 38 | | 20 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 18 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | 29 | 48 | | 25 | 70 | | 36 | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 50 | | 38 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 20 | | | 14 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 40 | 53 | | 32 | | | | | | | |
| 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 |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 25 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| 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 | 76 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 3 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| Percent Tested | 61% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 25 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| 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% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 0 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| 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% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 18 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the Areas of Focus?

The progress monitoring that was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the areas of focus included the BOY/MOY/EOY diagnostic assessments, i-Ready diagnostic assessments, Teach Town assessments and MPMs or Monthly Progress Monitoring assessments. Based on a review of the data student progress was inconsistent. Some students scored higher on the MOY assessment but showed a decrease on the EOY assessment. The significance of the students' disabilities may be a contributing factor to the inconsistency in academic progress.

Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data component that showed the most improvement was data for students with disabilities. The new actions our school took in this area were offering professional development to help teachers differentiate instruction and data analysis. Data chats with teachers allowed us to target where and when interventions needed to take place.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

Based on the FSAA results from the 2021 administration, middle school ELA results showed that a higher percentage of students achieved level 3 proficiency over the percentage of students achieving level 3 proficiency in math (50% vs. 38%). High school ELA results showed that a smaller percentage of students received level 3 proficiency over the percentage of students scoring level 3 proficiency in math (5.2% vs. 17%).

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The trends that emerge across grade levels demonstrate growth for both ELA and Math for 6th, 8th, 9th, 11th and 12th grades. There was neither an increase or decrease for ELA data in the 7th and 10th grade. Overall, the trend shows higher growth in Math compared to overall growth in ELA. Additionally, the practice FSAA for Reading showed an increase over time of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on the assessment. We went from 11 students to 25 students scoring levels 3 and 4. For math, there was a gradual increase among the students scoring levels 3 and 4 on this assessment. We went from 17 students to 28 students scoring levels 3 and 4.

What strategies need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will implement ongoing professional development regarding the use of new curriculum and research-based instructional strategies. We will also continue both coaching cycles for teachers and classroom walkthroughs with actionable feedback. We will target small groups of struggling students with strategies based on Universal Design for Learning. We will also implement project-based learning while piloting departmentalization.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Magnolia will continue to offer additional ongoing professional development centered on providing individualized education based on students' unique needs. Professional development will be facilitated by both resource staff as well as experts within the district. Teachers will also be engaged in professional learning communities where they will collaborate with colleagues regarding effective instructional practices for the targeted subgroups. Teachers will be provided with information about professional development opportunities and will be motivated to attend these trainings.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Effective instructional practice that focuses on standards-aligned instruction leads to improvement in student achievement. While student data demonstrates that students are making learning gains, there is still room for improvement in Reading and Math as it relates to grade level expectations.

Rationale:

Continued focus and monitoring of the strategies implemented in 2021-2022 will lead to embedded instructional practice that should result in goal attainment for the 2021-2022 school year. In addition, focusing on standards--based instruction regarding our subgroups will insure teachers maintain rigor for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of 2021-2022, it is expected that there will be a 10% increase over the 2018-2019 results in Reading and Math for students taking the FSAA.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

During weekly PLCs, collaborative lesson planning will be done with the curriculum resource teacher (CRT) and the instructional coach. The execution of the lessons will be monitored by the assistant principal for instruction, the CRT and the instructional coach participate in daily classroom walkthroughs using the classroom walkthrough protocol. Teachers will receive frequent actionable feedback on their planning and lesson delivery.

**Person responsible for
monitoring outcome:**

Wendy Lee (wendy.lee@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Collaborative lesson planning is the evidence-based strategy that is being implemented for this Area of Focus. Different teams of teachers that are grouped together based upon the grade and content collaborate weekly, planning lessons utilizing effective instructional strategies; debriefing these strategies, and analyzing data for improving delivery, re-teaching or differentiating instruction to further implement interventions in order to increase student achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-
based Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Collaborative lesson planning allows teams of teachers and instructional coaches to share and utilize effective instructional strategies that benefit larger groups of students.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will collaborate with their teams and with instructional coaches to share effective strategies for instructional delivery.

Person Responsible

Wendy Lee (wendy.lee@ocps.net)

Teachers will be provided with resources and professional development during collaborative planning regarding how to incorporate technology in their instructional delivery.

Person Responsible

Joshua Adkins (joshua.adkins@ocps.net)

During PLCs, teachers will focus on common strategies for implementation that are aligned to standards. Resource teachers will conduct peer observations and provide actionable feedback and coaching during sessions to frequently monitor instruction in the classrooms for appropriate demonstration of evidence-based PLC practices.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Monitoring ESSA

Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

Data from the 2018-19 school year revealed that there were four ESSA subgroups where the overall federal index was below 41%. These subgroups of students were: students with disabilities (federal index =35%); black/African American students (federal index =40%); Hispanic students (federal index =17%); and economically disadvantaged students (federal index =31%). More focused and frequent support aligned with evidence-based strategies for instructing these different subgroups would have been beneficial for these students.

Small group instruction will be provided to students with disabilities daily to build their skills in reading and math. Specific computer-based programs such as TeachTown and i-Ready allow students to work at their own pace, re-coup areas of deficits, and build on these for improved academic achievement.

Their work and pacing will be regularly monitored by their teachers. Once per week, the instructional coaches will monitor the data and help teachers in using the data to alter and drive instruction.

Many of the instructional strategies utilized for students with disabilities will be applied to black/African American students. Small group instruction, specific computer-based programs, as well as tutoring services will help to improve their academic achievement. Instruction will be monitored by the use of the classroom walkthrough protocol done by the instructional coaches and the administration. The frequent actionable feedback provided to teachers will be used to help them deliver more effective instruction and hence improve student achievement. Frequent progress monitoring assessments will also be implemented to help teachers analyze student data and make the necessary changes required for student success.

Teachers will administer diagnostic assessments with Hispanic students, meet with the leadership team to review data, and develop a plan of action to increase student performance. Teachers will implement the action plans and continue to monitor student performance throughout the year. They will adjust the action plans as dictated by student performance on frequent progress monitoring data. The administration will frequently observe instruction to ensure that students receive differentiated instruction based on their individual learning needs. The administration will provide actionable feedback to teachers on this instruction.

The economically disadvantaged students will be offered weekly tutoring for reading and math. Tutoring resources are evidence-based and teachers will use these scripted resources to help improve student performance.

#2. Other specifically relating to Social and Emotional Learning**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Social and emotional learning help shape our students' behaviors. A lack of social and emotional awareness may cause maladaptive behaviors which often result in students committing infractions that are counterproductive to school's norms and violate our code of student conduct. Infractions of the code of student conduct result in suspensions where students are removed from the learning environment. When they are absent from the learning environment, it impacts their ability to learn which can lower student achievement. In 2020-2021, 20% of students had one or more suspensions. This increase can be attributed to the way student behaviors were documented. Threatening behaviors for our significantly impaired student population were now being documented through the discipline procedures as opposed to through the IEP process.

Measurable**Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

In the 2020-2021 school year, 20% of students had one or more suspensions. Cognia survey data for 2020-2021 support this outcome as well. By the end of 2021-2022, it is expected that there will be a 10% decrease in the number of students who receive one or more suspensions over that percentage of students receiving suspensions in the 2020-2021 school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The behavior analysts will confer with the behavior specialists weekly to review behavioral data and make adjustments as needed for effective strategy implementation.

**Person responsible
for monitoring
outcome:**

Jessica Dunn (jessica.dunn@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Our school implemented social-emotional learning by adopting the district's CASEL program. Students have been taught to understand their self-awareness and will continue to learn about emotional intelligence and how these two impact appropriate behavior that ultimately improves self-management. Students will continue to learn social skills through direct instruction as they pertain to their social-emotional intelligence.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Utilizing the district's CASEL program for teaching social-emotional learning will continue to allow us to benefit from evidence-based methods that result in positive outcomes for students.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Behavior specialists will teach replacement behaviors by instructing students to recognize their own emotions, verbalize their emotions, and manage their emotions.

Person Responsible Jessica Dunn (jessica.dunn@ocps.net)

Behavior specialists will teach students to communicate feelings effectively by replacing their verbal threats with expressions of feelings and instruct them to ask for help working through these emotions.

Person Responsible Candace Gomez (candace.gomez@ocps.net)

The behavior analyst will frequently monitor instruction of the CASEL initiative, and provide feedback to the behavior specialists.

Person Responsible Candace Gomez (candace.gomez@ocps.net)

The behavior analyst will maintain running records regarding feedback provided from the behavior specialists and their evidence of instructional proficiency as demonstrated in a reduction in suspensions and improved student behaviors.

Person Responsible Jessica Dunn (jessica.dunn@ocps.net)

Monitoring ESSA

Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

Effective social-emotional learning initiatives utilizing the district's CASEL program support student success in social-emotional intelligence for all students including all ESSA subgroups.

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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, our school engages in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, we use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, our

school uses the district's CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Our stakeholders include several different groups of individuals and or organizations/businesses. A core team of teachers, (our school leadership team) including a mental health designee and administrators, attend the district-wide professional learning throughout the year. This core team works with the broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, another group of stakeholders, based on our school and community needs. Our school leadership team collaborates with students, staff and families through processes such as the PTA and SAC to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. We strategically utilize staff to bridge the community, local businesses and school. We strive to connect families with resources and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.