

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# **Table of Contents**

| School Demographics            | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 26 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

# **Odyssey Preparatory Charter Academy**

1350 WYOMING DR SE, Palm Bay, FL 32909

http://www.odysseyprepacademy.com

Demographics

# **Principal: Shelly Miedona**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Active   |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-5  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| 2020-21 Title I School  | Yes  |
| 2020-21 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3)   | 93%  |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an<br>asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged<br>Students |
| School Grades History   | 2018-19: B (61%)<br>2017-18: B (57%)<br>2016-17: B (59%)   |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | ormation*  |
| SI Region   | Southeast  |
| Regional Executive Director   | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield   |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle   | N/A  |
| Year  |  |
| Support Tier  |  |
| ESSA Status   |  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. Fo  | or more information, <u>click here</u> .   |
|   |  |

#### **School Board Approval**

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard 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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

#### 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               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 18 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

Brevard - 6541 - Odyssey Preparatory Charter Academy - 2021-22 SIP

# **Odyssey Preparatory Charter Academy**

1350 WYOMING DR SE, Palm Bay, FL 32909

#### http://www.odysseyprepacademy.com

**School Demographics** 

| School Type and Gr<br>(per MSID F |          | 2020-21 Title I School | Disadvant           | Economically<br>taged (FRL) Rate<br>ted on Survey 3) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Elementary S<br>KG-5              | chool    | Yes                    |                     | 87%  |
| Primary Servic<br>(per MSID F     | •••      | Charter School         | (Reporte            | Minority Rate<br>ed as Non-white<br>Survey 2)        |
| K-12 General Ec                   | ducation | Yes                    |                     | 60%  |
| School Grades Histo               | ry       |                        |                     |  |
| Year<br>Grade                     | 2020-21  | <b>2019-20</b><br>B    | <b>2018-19</b><br>B | <b>2017-18</b><br>B                                  |
| School Board Approv               | val      |                        |                     |  |

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard 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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### 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 Odyssey Preparatory Academy is to work in partnership with the family and community, with the aim of helping each child reach full potential in all areas of life. We seek to educate the whole child with the understanding that each person must achieve a balance of intellectual, emotional, physical, spiritual, and social skills as a foundation for life.

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

The vision of Odyssey Preparatory Academy is to create a school committed to academic excellence and the education of the whole child. We achieve this by providing accessible quality Montessori education and programs that develop healthy classroom and school communities. The school's aim is to prepare children to reach their full potential while playing a responsible role in protecting the global environment and fostering peace and harmony within our school and community.

#### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name               | Position<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|--------------------|------------------------|--|
| Miedona,<br>Shelly | Principal              | Over all administration of instructional program and campus level operations.<br>Ensures educational strategies are in place that support effective learning for<br>all students. Serves as a facilitator, guide and supporter of quality instructional<br>practices.      |
| Davis,<br>Mike     | Assistant<br>Principal | Assist the school principal in overall administration of instructional program<br>and campus level<br>operations. Coordinate assigned student activities and services.   |
| Guevara,<br>Leslie | Instructional<br>Coach | Support teachers and provide resources, feedback, modeling, and<br>professional development to help meet instructional goals and school<br>improvement goals. Participation in grade level professional learning<br>communities examining data and instructional practice. |
| Cimirro,<br>Marie  | Instructional<br>Coach | Support teachers and provide resources, feedback, modeling, and<br>professional development to help meet instructional goals and school<br>improvement goals. Participation in grade level professional learning<br>communities examining data and instructional practice. |

#### **Demographic Information**

#### **Principal start date**

Thursday 7/1/2021, Shelly Miedona

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.

3

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

Total number of students enrolled at the school

411

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year. 8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year. 9

**Demographic Data** 

#### Early Warning Systems

#### 2021-22

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | κ           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 74          | 67 | 60 | 78 | 69 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 411   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 30          | 22 | 24 | 19 | 16 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 138   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 1           | 1  | 3  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 3  | 15 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 28    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 4           | 9  | 7  | 18 | 17 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 78    |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |    | Gra | de | Lev | el |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|----|-----|----|-----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | Κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5   | 6  | 7   | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 16 | 12  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 37    |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indiantar                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                           | κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 4           | 5 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 15    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/13/2021

#### 2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                                 | κ           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled               | 57          | 50 | 56 | 55 | 63 | 71 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 403   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 1           | 6  | 4  | 1  | 6  | 3  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 24    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 1           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 5  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | Lev | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 5 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 25 | 26  | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 78    |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           |   |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|
| Indicator                           | κ | 1 | 2           | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1 | 1 | 4           | 4 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |  |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |  |  |

#### 2020-21 - Updated

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

#### Brevard - 6541 - Odyssey Preparatory Charter Academy - 2021-22 SIP

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                                 | κ           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled               | 57          | 50 | 56 | 55 | 63 | 71 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 403   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 1           | 6  | 4  | 1  | 6  | 3  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 24    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 1           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 5  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |    |   |   |   |    |    | Total |       |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| Indicator                            |             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12    | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 5           | 7 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 25 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 78    |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| Indicator                           |             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12    | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1           | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 18    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 1     |

## 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).

| Sobool Grada Component      | 2021   |          |       |        | 2019     |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 62%    | 62%      | 57%   | 63%    | 60%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 60%    | 60%      | 58%   | 54%    | 54%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 53%    | 57%      | 53%   | 56%    | 46%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 67%    | 63%      | 63%   | 62%    | 62%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 70%    | 65%      | 62%   | 57%    | 59%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 48%    | 53%      | 51%   | 47%    | 49%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 67%    | 57%      | 53%   | 62%    | 57%      | 55%   |

#### 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03          | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|             | 2019     | 64%    | 64%      | 0%                                | 58%   | 6%                             |
| Cohort Corr | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04          | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|             | 2019     | 59%    | 61%      | -2%                               | 58%   | 1%                             |
| Cohort Corr | parison  | -64%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05          | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|             | 2019     | 56%    | 60%      | -4%                               | 56%   | 0%                             |
| Cohort Corr | nparison | -59%   |          |                                   |       |                                |

|           |          |        | MATH     |                                   |       |                                |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade     | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03        | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 73%    | 61%      | 12%                               | 62%   | 11%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04        | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 66%    | 64%      | 2%                                | 64%   | 2%                             |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -73%   |          |                                   | · · · |                                |
| 05        | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 59%    | 60%      | -1%                               | 60%   | -1%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -66%   |          |                                   | • •   |                                |

|            |          |        | SCIEN    | CE                                |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 65%    | 56%      | 9%                                | 53%   | 12%                            |
| Cohort Com | nparison |        |          |                                   | ·     |                                |

## Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

### Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

i-Ready is used as Odyssey Preparatory Academy's progress monitoring tool.

|                          |   | Grade 1   |  |   |
|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency   | Fall  | Winter                                   | Spring                                    |
|                          | All Students  | 16%   | 29%                                      | 67%                                       |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically<br>Disadvantaged   | 16%   | 29%                                      | 67%                                       |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities   | 20%   | 40%                                      | 70%                                       |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 0%  | 0%                                       | 0%  |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency   | Fall  | Winter                                   | Spring                                    |
|                          | All Students  | 16%   | 37%                                      | 48%                                       |
| Mathematics              | Economically<br>Disadvantaged   | 16%   | 37%                                      | 48%                                       |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities   | 20%   | 30%                                      | 60%                                       |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 0%  | 0%                                       | 0%  |
|                          |   | Grade 2   |  |   |
|                          |   | Orace 2   |  |   |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency   | Fall  | Winter                                   | Spring                                    |
|                          | Proficiency<br>All Students   |   | Winter<br>45%                            | Spring<br>58%                             |
| English Language<br>Arts | Proficiency<br>All Students<br>Economically<br>Disadvantaged  | Fall  |  |   |
|                          | Proficiency<br>All Students<br>Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students With<br>Disabilities   | Fall<br>16%   | 45%                                      | 58%                                       |
|                          | Proficiency<br>All Students<br>Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students With<br>Disabilities<br>English Language<br>Learners   | Fall<br>16%<br>16%  | 45%<br>45%                               | 58%<br>58%                                |
|                          | Proficiency<br>All Students<br>Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students With<br>Disabilities<br>English Language<br>Learners<br>Number/%<br>Proficiency              | Fall<br>16%<br>16%<br>33%<br>0%<br>Fall                                     | 45%<br>45%<br>43%<br>0%<br>Winter        | 58%<br>58%<br>57%<br>20%<br>Spring        |
|                          | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students                            | Fall<br>16%<br>16%<br>33%<br>0%   | 45%<br>45%<br>43%<br>0%                  | 58%<br>58%<br>57%<br>20%                  |
|                          | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall<br>16%<br>16%<br>33%<br>0%<br>Fall                                     | 45%<br>45%<br>43%<br>0%<br>Winter        | 58%<br>58%<br>57%<br>20%<br>Spring        |
| Arts                     | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically               | Fall         16%         16%         33%         0%         Fall         3% | 45%<br>45%<br>43%<br>0%<br>Winter<br>12% | 58%<br>58%<br>57%<br>20%<br>Spring<br>20% |

|                          |   | Grade 3  |   |   |
|--------------------------|---|--|---|---|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency   | Fall   | Winter                                    | Spring                                    |
|                          | All Students  | 37%  | 56%                                       | 54%                                       |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically<br>Disadvantaged   | 37%  | 56%                                       | 54%                                       |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities   | 10%  | 18%                                       | 100%                                      |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 0%   | 0%  | 27%                                       |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency   | Fall   | Winter                                    | Spring                                    |
|                          | All Students  | 8%   | 23%                                       | 38%                                       |
| Mathematics              | Economically<br>Disadvantaged   | 8%   | 23%                                       | 38%                                       |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities   | 10%  | 9%  | 100%                                      |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 0%   | 0%  | 18%                                       |
|                          |   |  |   |   |
|                          |   | Grade 4  |   |   |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency   | Fall   | Winter                                    | Spring                                    |
|                          | Proficiency<br>All Students   |  | Winter<br>58%                             | Spring<br>62%                             |
| English Language<br>Arts | Proficiency<br>All Students<br>Economically<br>Disadvantaged  | Fall   |   |   |
|                          | Proficiency<br>All Students<br>Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students With<br>Disabilities   | Fall<br>51%  | 58%                                       | 62%                                       |
|                          | Proficiency<br>All Students<br>Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students With<br>Disabilities<br>English Language<br>Learners   | Fall<br>51%<br>51%   | 58%<br>58%                                | 62%<br>62%                                |
|                          | Proficiency<br>All Students<br>Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students With<br>Disabilities<br>English Language   | Fall<br>51%<br>51%<br>15%  | 58%<br>58%<br>36%                         | 62%<br>62%<br>21%<br>20%<br>Spring        |
|                          | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students                            | Fall<br>51%<br>51%<br>15%<br>33%   | 58%<br>58%<br>36%<br>17%                  | 62%<br>62%<br>21%<br>20%                  |
|                          | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall<br>51%<br>51%<br>15%<br>33%<br>Fall                                     | 58%<br>58%<br>36%<br>17%<br>Winter        | 62%<br>62%<br>21%<br>20%<br>Spring        |
| Arts                     | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically               | Fall         51%         51%         15%         33%         Fall         8% | 58%<br>58%<br>36%<br>17%<br>Winter<br>36% | 62%<br>62%<br>21%<br>20%<br>Spring<br>56% |

|                          |  | Grade 5 |        |        |
|--------------------------|--|---------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 55%     | 55%    | 65%    |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically<br>Disadvantaged  | 55%     | 55%    | 65%    |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities  | 45%     | 36%    | 55%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 25%     | 0%     | 50%    |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 16%     | 36%    | 53%    |
| Mathematics              | Economically<br>Disadvantaged  | 16%     | 36%    | 53%    |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities  | 9%      | 36%    | 45%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 0%      | 0%     | 25%    |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                          | All Students   | 14%     | 26%    | 66%    |
| Science                  | Economically<br>Disadvantaged  | 14%     | 26%    | 66%    |
|                          | Students With<br>Disabilities  | 0%      | 27%    | 36%    |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners   | 0%      | 0%     | 33%    |
|                          |  | Grade   |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students<br>Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students With<br>Disabilities<br>English Language<br>Learners |         |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students<br>Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students With<br>Disabilities<br>English Language<br>Learners |         |        |        |

## Subgroup Data Review

|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 28          | 35        | 27                | 30           | 50         |                    | 36          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 32          | 21        |                   | 26           | 33         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 47          | 36        | 18                | 38           | 36         |                    | 50          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 58          | 45        |                   | 55           | 36         |                    | 33          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 63          | 82        |                   | 58           | 36         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 66          | 58        |                   | 60           | 35         |                    | 60          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 53          | 43        | 22                | 46           | 30         | 44                 | 44          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          | -                       |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 37          | 64        | 73                | 42           | 58         | 43                 | 27          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 57          | 53        |                   | 46           | 69         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 47          | 48        | 41                | 53           | 74         | 62                 | 50          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 61          | 57        |                   | 63           | 69         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 71          | 62        |                   | 76           | 62         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 71          | 69        | 62                | 76           | 70         | 42                 | 76          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 62          | 60        | 53                | 67           | 70         | 48                 | 67          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2018      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2016-17 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2016-17 |
| SWD       | 43          | 58        | 50                | 45           | 42         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 58          | 61        |                   | 53           | 53         | 45                 | 50          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 42          | 35        | 42                | 47           | 44         | 30                 | 47          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 71          | 57        |                   | 87           | 83         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 73          | 61        |                   | 70           | 62         | 58                 | 83          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 63          | 54        | 56                | 62           | 57         | 47                 | 62          |            |              |                         |                           |

### 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  | 46  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 | 61  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 370 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |  |  |  |  |  |

| ESSA Federal Index   |     |
|--|-----|
| Percent Tested   | 98% |
| Subgroup Data  |     |
| Students With Disabilities   |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 34  |
| 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                                      | 35  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| 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                                | 38  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 48  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |     |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 60  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |
| 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   | 56  |  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |     |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |  |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 43  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |  |
| 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.

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

Students with disabilities proficiency and learning gains have decreased in ELA and Math. In addition, it is our lowest ESSA data at 49%. Black ELA achievement and learning gains also decreased. Hispanic ELA and Math achievement, learning gains increased.

# What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

i-Ready Spring 2021 data shows that Math proficiency for all students, SWD and ELL is a need for improvement. In addition, lowest quartile math is a need for improvement based on 2019 FSA data.

# What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Due to Covid restriction, teachers were not comfortable providing small group instruction and response to intervention group instruction. In addition, approximately a third of our students were at home working in an e-learing environment.

Using Title I dollars, we purchased a new math intervention program to close the previous year's foundational learning deficiencies. We have developed an Intensive Intervention Plan tracking student data K-5 to ensure student academic needs are met in ELA, Math and Science.

# What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the 2019 FSA data, math learning gains increased by 13% to 70%. Math achievement also increased by 5% to 67%. Science achievement increased to 67%. Fall to spring i-Ready data for 4th grade increased from 8% to 56% proficiency.

# What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Small group instruction both face to face and virtually was consistent and effective. Teachers used differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students. Teachers participated in weekly Collaborative Planning (PLC) meetings to unpack standards, plan rigorous math lessons, model strategies and receive professional development. Teachers participated in a professional development of CRA. The Concrete, Representational, Abstract model of instruction was used with fidelity.

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

Odyssey Preparatory Academy will continue weekly PLCs for ELA, Math and Science. In addition, differentiated small group instruction and walk to intervention will occur daily for 30-45 minutes. Teachers will be planning for this instruction documenting the intervention used in their lesson plans. Every 6 weeks the Intensive Intervention Team will meet to analyze data to ensure gaps are closing and students are making gains.

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.

Teachers and leaders will receive professional development in Do the Math, Leveled Literacy Intervention and Just Words. In addition, teachers will participate in weekly PLCs facilitated by an instructional leader.

# Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We will hold after school tutoring and Saturday school to ensure students are sustaining academic growth and proficiency in ELA and Math. Extended care program will incorporate an enrichment class to offer academic support to K-5 students to ensure sustainability.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

### **#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

|  | 1 3 6  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Area of<br>Focus<br>Description<br>and<br>Rationale:   | Due to Covid restriction, teachers were not comfortable providing small group instruction<br>and response to intervention group instruction. In addition, approximately a third of our<br>students were at home working in an e-learing environment. Student behaviors during<br>breakout sessions inhibited the teachers ability to conduct small group instruction. Progress<br>monitoring data specific to interventions was not collected. As a result, ELA and Math<br>learning gains and lowest 25% dropped significantly from 2019 to 2021 data.  |  |
| Measurable<br>Outcome:                                 | Odyssey Prep Academy will increase the learning gains of students on the FSA Math from 36% to 60%. Increase the learning gains of students in the lowest 25th percentile on FSA ELA from 19% to 60%. Increasing the learning gains of students in the lowest 25th percentile on FSA Math from 38% to 60%. Increase student proficiency in Science from 51% to 60% proficiency.   |  |
| Monitoring:  | Using Title I and ESSER II Instructional Coaches and Interventionists (ELA, Math, Science), students will be selected, placed and monitored in instructional groups based on the lowest quartile. Lowest quartile, learning gains and science proficiency will be monitored using two methods. First, using focused classroom walkthroughs during small group and acceleration(intervention) time to verify fidelity and quality of instruction, implementation and intervention curriculum. Second, individual student progress monitoring based on intervention, monthly progress monitoring using i-Ready, and classroom standards mastery assessments. Once data is collected from these two methods, the Intensive Intervention Team will meet every 4-6 weeks to analyze the data collected and make adjustments to action steps based on data analysis. |  |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome: | Shelly Miedona (miedonas@odysseyprepacademy.com)   |  |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:                        | Implementation of a comprehensive intervention plan that includes focused classroom small group instruction and intensive intervention.  |  |
| Rationale<br>for<br>Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:    | According to Hattie, Response to Intervention has a 1.29 effect size this means when a comprehensive intervention plan is implemented effectively, students have an opportunity to make over a years worth of growth.<br>Based on DuFour's Professional Learning Community Model and results-oriented thinking, "In a PLC the focus is not on what one intends to do but, rather, the results of actions.<br>There must be an ongoing assessment of programs and initiatives in the school, and common formative assessments are vital." (Jessie in The Elements of a Professional Learning Community)   |  |
| Action Steps to Implement                              |  |  |

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

Identify the students in the lowest quartile for Math, ELA and Science.

Person Responsible Shelly Miedona (miedonas@odysseyprepacademy.com)

Train teachers in LLI, Just Words, Oral Reading Fluency, Do the Math, differentiated instruction, and data analysis.

 Person
 Shelly Miedona (miedonas@odysseyprepacademy.com)

Develop a schedule to begin walk to intervention (acceleration) in grades K-5. Develop a schedule for Science intervention grade 5 and put STEAM on the special rotation for grades K-5. Increase the amount of time Gifted and Talented students are participating in the Gateway Program.

#### Person

Responsible Shelly Miedona (miedonas@odysseyprepacademy.com)

Provide training/coaching to teachers who need support with small group differentiation during the ELA and Math blocks

#### Person

Responsible Marie Cimirro (cimirrom@odysseyprepacademy.com)

Conduct focused classroom walk throughs during differentiated small group instruction for ELA and Math as well as during walk to intervention (acceleration). Provide specific feedback to teachers following the walk throughs.

#### Person

Responsible Shelly Miedona (miedonas@odysseyprepacademy.com)

Progress monitoring data will be collected and analyzed by the Intensive Intervention Team (Title I academic coaches, Title I SEL interventionists, ESSER II interventionists, classroom teacher, administration, MTSS coordinator) every 4-6 weeks to monitor progress and make adjustments to the groups and/or intervention being used.

#### Person Responsible Mike Davis (davism@odysseyprepacademy.com)

Teachers, coaches and administration will conduct data chats with students to monitor progress in grades K-5.

#### Person

Responsible Mike Davis (davism@odysseyprepacademy.com)

Based on the analysis of data, instructional changes will be made. This could include changing whole group instructional delivery method or resources, small group delivery method, resources or interventionist.

The data will be used to develop action plans to address concerns or issues.

#### Person

Responsible Mike Davis (davism@odysseyprepacademy.com)

| Area of<br>Focus<br>Description<br>and<br>Rationale:   | Through collaborative planning, Odyssey Preparatory Academy will have a focused area<br>on implementation of all core curriculum. Student achievement in all content areas<br>decreased from 2019 to 2022. In addition, based on classroom walkthroughs and<br>examination of lesson plans, teachers were utilizing instructional materials that deviated<br>from the core curriculum adopted by Odyssey Charter Schools. |
|--|---|
| Measurable<br>Outcome:                                 | Odyssey Preparatory Academy will increase ELA proficiency from 59% to 62%, Math proficiency from 53% to 60% and Science proficiency from 51% to 60% in all tested grade levels.   |
| Monitoring   | Academic coaches will be at each professional learning collaborative meeting. Agendas, meeting notes and attendance will be collected and uploaded into SharePoint for administration and other grade levels to review. In addition, lesson plans will be monitored weekly to ensure core curriculum is sited and used for whole group instruction.   |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome: | Marie Cimirro (cimirrom@odysseyprepacademy.com)   |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:                        | Professional Learning Communities will be developed in each grade level K-5 for collaborative planning. Teachers will meet weekly to plan for whole group and small group differentiated instruction with an instructional coach. The grade teams will meet one day a week to collaborate in ELA, one day for Math and 5th grade will have an additional day to collaborate for Science.                                  |
| Rationale<br>for<br>Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:    | Based on DuFour's Professional Learning Community Model and results-oriented thinking,<br>"In a PLC the focus is not on what one intends to do but, rather, the results of actions.<br>There<br>must be an ongoing assessment of programs and initiatives in the school, and common<br>formative assessments are vital." (Jessie in The Elements of a Professional Learning<br>Community)                                 |
|  |   |

#### #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

K-2 teachers will meet each Tuesday to plan for Math with Title I academic coach, Leslie Guevara and Laura Lane from Green Apple. Thursday they will meet to plan for ELA with academic coach, Laurie Young or Charlotte Chase from Green Apple.

### Person

Leslie Guevara (guevaral@odysseyprepacademy.com) Responsible

3-5 teachers will meet each Tuesday to plan for Math with Title I academic coach, Marie Cimirro and Laura Lane from Green Apple. Thursday they will meet to plan for ELA with the academic coach along with Laurie Young or Charlotte Chase from Green Apple.

5th grade will plan for Science with Ms. Dent, science coach/interventionist to ensure standards are being addressed with fidelity using core instructional materials.

#### Person

Marie Cimirro (cimirrom@odysseyprepacademy.com) Responsible

Lesson plans will be checked weekly by administration looking for small group differentiated instruction as well as commitment to using core instructional materials adopted by Odyssey Charter Schools, Inc.

Person

Shelly Miedona (miedonas@odysseyprepacademy.com) Responsible

Progress monitoring data will be analyzed by the classroom teacher and the leadership team to monitor student progress and growth.

Person Responsible Shelly Miedona (miedonas@odysseyprepacademy.com)

Based on the analysis of data, instructional changes will be made. This could include changing whole group instructional delivery method or resources, small group delivery method, resources or interventionist.

The data will be used to develop action plans to address concerns or issues.

Person Responsible Mike Davis (davism@odysseyprepacademy.com)

Professional learning will be provided as needed based on student data and classroom observations.

Person Responsible Marie Cimirro (cimirrom@odysseyprepacademy.com)

| Area of<br>Focus<br>Description<br>and<br>Rationale:   | Professional Development on Authentic Learning<br>Due to community concerns, the board recommends teacher support in the implementation<br>of the rigorous state standards and focusing on neutrality and unity in all classrooms.<br>Through two needs assessments (spring 2021 teacher survey and fall 2021 root cause<br>analysis), teachers requested focused techniques in reducing the achievement gap and<br>improving interventions and acceleration. Finally, Spring 2021 data indicated regression for<br>students identified in gifted and talented (level 4 and 5) programs.   |
|--|--|
| Measurable<br>Outcome:                                 | Odyssey Preparatory Academy will increase ELA proficiency from 59% to 62%, Math proficiency from 53% to 60% and Science proficiency from 51% to 60% in all tested grade levels.  |
| Monitoring:  | Using Title I and ESSER II Instructional Coaches and Interventionists, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) will be implemented using DuFour's model. During PLCs, teachers will collaboratively plan based on the 4 essential questions: 1) What do we want all students to know and be able to do [based on state standards]; 2) How will we know if they learned it [Progress Monitoring}; 3) How will we respond when some students have not learned it [Intervention plan]; and 4) How will we extend the learning of students who are already proficient[acceleration plan]. Odyssey will develop a formal intervention plan collaboratively with teachers during PLC time and will monitor bi-weekly. |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome: | Shelly Miedona (miedonas@odysseyprepacademy.com)   |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:                        | Professional Learning Communities will be developed in each grade level K-5 for collaborative planning. Teachers will meet weekly to plan for whole group and small group differentiated instruction with an instructional coach. The grade teams will meet one day a week to collaborate in ELA, one day for Math and 5th grade will have an additional day to collaborate for Science. Best practices gained through professional learning opportunities are discussed and shared during the professional learning community process.  |
| Rationale<br>for<br>Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:    | Based on DuFour's Professional Learning Community Model and results-oriented thinking,<br>"In a PLC the focus is not on what one intends to do but, rather, the results of actions.<br>There<br>must be an ongoing assessment of programs and initiatives in the school, and common<br>formative assessments are vital." (Jessie in The Elements of a Professional Learning<br>Community)  |
|  |  |

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

K-2 teachers will meet each Tuesday to plan for math with Title I academic coach, Leslie Guevara and Laura Lane from Green Apple. Thursday they will meet to plan for ELA with their academic coach, Laurie Young or Charlotte Chase from Green Apple.

3-5 teachers will meet each Tuesday to plan for math with Title I academic coach, Marie Cimirro and Laura Lane from Green Apple. Thursday they will meet to plan for ELA with their academic coach, Laurie Young or Charlotte Chase from Green Apple.

5th grade will plan for Science with Ms. Dent, science coach/interventionist to ensure standards are being addressed with fidelity using core instructional materials.

Person

Responsible Marie Cimirro (cimirrom@odysseyprepacademy.com)

Classroom walk throughs will occur by administration and Title I academic coaches looking for small group differentiated instruction, rigorous station activities, accountable talk and student engagement with curriculum and content.

#### Person Responsible Shelly Miedona (miedonas@odysseyprepacademy.com)

Based on the data collected, teachers will be provided differentiated professional development. This will occur during the weekly PLC meetings, through the coaching cycle, one on one and/or during the Thursday mini PD days provided by the Green Apple Academic Team.

The data will be used to develop action plans to address concerns or issues.

# Person

Responsible Shelly Miedona (miedonas@odysseyprepacademy.com)

Using Title I and Title II funds, new teachers will participate in a 3 day New Teacher Institute that introduces the mission and vision, core curriculum, and shared beliefs. Following, teachers will participate in the New Teacher Induction Program that supports teachers new to Odyssey throughout the next three years. These teachers will also be assigned a mentor.

Person

**Responsible** Shelly Miedona (miedonas@odysseyprepacademy.com)

| #4. Other spe  | #4. Other specifically relating to Hospitality  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| Area of<br>Focus<br>Description<br>and<br>Rationale:   | Moving from customer service to hospitality in our actions, atmosphere, and media: 2021 parent surveys suggest that 69% of parents at Odyssey Preparatory Academy agree or strongly agree that communication about the school's goals and objectives was effectively shared.  |  |  |
| Measurable<br>Outcome:                                 | Odyssey Preparatory Academy will improve from 69% agree or strongly agree to 72% that communication about the school's goals and objectives was effectively shared.   |  |  |
| Monitoring:  | Through our Parents and Partners (PasP) meetings, staff will progress monitor our communication goal through exit tickets/surveys. A comprehensive parent survey will be completed in spring 2022. Through training and support, our front office personnel will hold check-in conversations seeking feedback.  |  |  |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome: | Mike Davis (davism@odysseyprepacademy.com)  |  |  |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:                        | To build a welcoming and supportive environment based on the needs of all stakeholders including students, parents, staff, community. Provide training and support on core hospitality best practices (physical environment, school-wide practices and policies, personal interactions/relationships, written materials, and communication strategies). |  |  |
| Rationale<br>for<br>Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:    | Based on research by The Houston Independent School District, a family and community engagement welcoming plan has the ability to change practices, beliefs and relationships related to the school. The central goal is to help stakeholders understand they are welcomed and working partners with the school.  |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |

#### Action Steps to Implement

Training of instructional and operational instructional staff on welcoming strategies.

#### Person

Responsible Monica Knight (knightm@odysseycharterschool.com)

Complete a welcoming environment walk through (physical environment, school-wide practices and policies, personal interactions/relationships, written materials, and communication strategies) with key stakeholders 2 - 3 times a year.

#### Person

Responsible Mike Davis (davism@odysseyprepacademy.com)

Based on the data collected from the welcoming walk throughs and previous school year surveys, additional training will be provided to instructional and operational staff members.

#### Person

Responsible Monica Knight (knightm@odysseycharterschool.com)

Culture and climate surveys will be conducted annually. The data will be used to develop action plans to address concerns or issues.

#### Person

Responsible Shelly Miedona (miedonas@odysseyprepacademy.com)

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

N/A

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

#### Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

As per our mission, at Odyssey Preparatory Academy we work in partnership with the family and community with the aim of helping each child reach full potential in all areas of life. We seek to educate the whole child with the understanding that each person much achieve a balance of intellectual, physical, emotional, spiritual and social skills as a foundation for life.

At Odyssey Prep we practice a collaborative environment through weekly PLCs with teachers and leadership, family engagement nights and Title 1 events. A goal of Odyssey Charter Schools, Inc is hospitality. We have open communication with all stakeholders and encourage input for school improvement.

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

Teachers- parent communication, positive relationships with staff, students and families Students- positive relationships with faculty and peers Families- promoting the school mission and positive relationship with faculty and one another Volunteers- assist teachers and students through classroom support Support Staff- assist teachers and students through classroom support Cafeteria Workers- providing nutritional meals that follow our wellness policy with a smile Bus Drivers- ensure safe and timely transportation to and from school daily Custodians- providing a clean, sanitary and welcoming learning and working environment Green Apple support- facilitate and support teachers, leadership and students to obtain maximum learning potential to attain our goals in a systematic process Board Members- Oversee the educational system to ensure our policies and regulations are ethical and sustainable to student achievement