

Orange County Public Schools

Odyssey Middle



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

Odyssey Middle

9290 LEE VISTA BLVD, Orlando, FL 32829

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

Demographics

Principal: Barbara Rumph

Start Date for this Principal: 3/4/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
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. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Odyssey Middle

9290 LEE VISTA BLVD, Orlando, FL 32829

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>72%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>83%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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.

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 Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Smith, Beatriz	Principal	Ms. Beatriz B. Smith - Principal; Responsible for overseeing curriculum and instruction, data analysis to ensure student achievement increases, and managing the learning environment.
Pritz, Jill	Assistant Principal	Ms. Jill Pritz- Assistant Principal; Monitors MTSS, oversees the ESE department, develops and implements the teacher induction program, shares research-based practices with teachers through ongoing instructional leadership methodologies, and assists principal in curriculum and instruction, and data analysis.
Dewitt, Kimberly	Staffing Specialist	Ms. Kimberly Dewitt - Staffing Specialist; Coordinates all IEP meetings for compliance and ensures IEP goals are being implemented and monitored to best meet student needs.
Stanley, Lori	Other	Ms. Lori Stanley - SAFE Coordinator. Responsible for the implementation and monitoring of the school SEL plan and Mental Health strategies. Threat Assessment leader and Title IX coordinator.
Finnin, Traci	Instructional Media	Ms. Tracy Finnin -Media Specialist; Assists teachers with selecting appropriate literature in the classroom for instruction and to increase reading by students. Assists teachers with digital implementation and best practices related to digital instruction in the classroom.
Kitts, Natalie	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Natalie Kitts - Instructional Coach/Testing Coordinator; Works with teachers to improve instruction and uses research-based strategies during instructional planning to obtain the maximum results possible in regards to student achievement.
Maldonado, Javier	Dean	Mr. Javier Maldonado - 7th/8th Grade Dean; Maintains a safe and orderly environment for students, facilitates restorative justice practices, and fosters positive relationships with students, faculty, and parents.
MacDougall, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Ms. Stephanie MacDougall - ECS/MTSS Coach; Assists teachers with interventions for the MTSS process. ESOL CT; Responsible for ESOL compliance concerns which includes testing students for the ESOL program and monitoring their progress.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Provides ELL strategies to teachers as needed.
Bennett, Tommy	Assistant Principal	Mr. Tommy Bennett - Assistant Principal; Creates a master schedule that allows focus on student instruction to meet the needs of all students, oversees the Curriculum Council/PLCs, shares research-based practices with teachers through ongoing instructional leadership methodologies, and assists principal in curriculum and instruction, and data analysis.
Greene, Chandar	Other	Dr. Greene - PASS Coordinator; Helps students maintain focus on academics when serving in an alternative suspension program, provides social skills lessons to students, and conducts restorative justice circles as needed.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 3/4/2019, Barbara Rumph

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.*

0

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

Total number of students enrolled at the school

676

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

7

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

4

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	222	235	219	0	0	0	0	676
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	43	56	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	12	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	12	56	0	0	0	0	82
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	23	39	0	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	35	31	0	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	36	36	0	0	0	0	102
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	35	31	0	0	0	0	91

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	29	39	61	0	0	0	0	129

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	5	6	16	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/20/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	253	253	272	0	0	0	0	778
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	54	79	0	0	0	0	156
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	13	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	81	100	0	0	0	0	196
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	53	31	0	0	0	0	114
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	48	44	0	0	0	0	128
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	45	47	0	0	0	0	124

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	39	75	93	0	0	0	0	207

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	12	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4

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	253	253	272	0	0	0	0	778
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	54	79	0	0	0	0	156
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	13	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	81	100	0	0	0	0	196
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	53	31	0	0	0	0	114
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	48	44	0	0	0	0	128
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	45	47	0	0	0	0	124

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	39	75	93	0	0	0	0	207

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	12	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4

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				55%	52%	54%	53%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	52%	54%	47%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	45%	47%	40%	42%	47%
Math Achievement				54%	55%	58%	52%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains				50%	55%	57%	48%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	50%	51%	40%	44%	51%
Science Achievement				55%	51%	51%	59%	51%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				75%	67%	72%	64%	68%	72%

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
06	2021					
	2019	50%	52%	-2%	54%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	53%	48%	5%	52%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
08	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	28%	43%	-15%	55%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	53%	49%	4%	54%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
08	2021					
	2019	33%	36%	-3%	46%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	51%	49%	2%	48%	3%
Cohort Comparison						

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	73%	66%	7%	71%	2%
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	82%	63%	19%	61%	21%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	90%	53%	37%	57%	33%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready Diagnostics (BOY, MOY, EOY) Reading and Mathematics, Grades 6-8
 Progress Monitoring Activity (PMA's 1, 2, & 3) for Algebra, Geometry, Civics, 8th Grade Science

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	107/212 (50%)	106/221 (48)	119/212 (56%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	36/81 (44%)	32/84 (38%)	36/83 (43%)
	Students With Disabilities	2/23 (9%)	3/22 (14%)	4/23 (17%)
	English Language Learners	16/51 (31%)	16/52 (31%)	20/50 (40%)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	84/216 (39%)	100/222 (45)	120/223 (54%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/83 (30%)	33/85 (39%)	37/88 (42%)
	Students With Disabilities	3/23 (13%)	5/22 (23%)	5/23 (22%)
	English Language Learners	15/52 (29%)	18/52 (35%)	25/53 (47%)

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	100/202 (50%)	101/212 (48%)	82/198 (41%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	30/79 (38%)	29/80 (36%)	23/75 (31%)
	Students With Disabilities	0/24 (0%)	5/25 (20%)	3/22 (14%)
	English Language Learners	16/41 (39%)	20/49 (41%)	13/44 (30%)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	Math 54/174 (31%) Algebra 32/36 (89%)	Math 60/189 (32%) Algebra 31/36 (86%)	Math 72/181 (40%) Algebra 33/35 (94%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	Math 18/74 (24%) Algebra 7/8 (88%)	Math 23/79 (29%) Algebra 7/9 (78%)	Math 19/74 (26%) Algebra 8/9 (89%)
	Students With Disabilities	Math 1/25 (4%) Algebra 0/0 (0%)	Math 5/27 (19%) Algebra 0/0 (0%)	Math 4/25 (16%) Algebra 0/0 (0%)
	English Language Learners	Math 12/39 (31%) Algebra 2/2 (100%)	Math 11/47 (23%) Algebra 2/2 (100%)	Math 14/44 (32%) Algebra 2/2 (100%)
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	147/199 (74%)	163/227 (72%)	157/237 (66%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	49/72 (68%)	60/92 (65%)	51/92 (55%)
	Students With Disabilities	6/21 (29%)	16/25 (64%)	7/28 (25%)
	English Language Learners	20/33 (61%)	27/46 (59%)	27/51 (53%)

Grade 8				
Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	124/240 (52%)	132/247 (53%)	134/252 (53%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	43/97 (44%)	46/100 (46%)	48/104 (46%)
	Students With Disabilities	1/23 (4%)	7/26 (27%)	3/26 (12%)
	English Language Learners	11/32 (34%)	14/32 (44%)	12/32 (38%)
Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	Math 14/95 (15%) Algebra 54/89 (61%) Geometry 45/65 (69%)	Math 25/100 (25%) Algebra 57/75 (76%) Geometry 55/66 (83%)	Math 27/96 (28%) Algebra 62/81 (77%) Geometry 56/64 (88%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	Math 6/48 (13%) Algebra 21/32 (66%) Geometry 13/22 (59%)	Math 7/51 (14%) Algebra 17/24 (71%) Geometry 17/22 (77%)	Math 11/48 (23%) Algebra 23/30 (77%) Geometry 19/22 (86%)
	Students With Disabilities	Math 1/19 (5%) Algebra 2/6 (33%) Geometry 0/1 (0%)	Math 2/21 (10%) Algebra 3/4 (75%) Geometry 1/1 (100%)	Math 0/21 (0%) Algebra 3/4 (75%) Geometry 1/1 (100%)
	English Language Learners	Math 3/20 (15%) Algebra 7/10 (70%) Geometry 3/3 (100%)	Math 6/21 (29%) Algebra 9/10 (90%) Geometry 3/3 (100%)	Math 7/21 (33%) Algebra 6/10 (60%) Geometry 3/3 (100%)
Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	87/222 (39%)	95/221 (43%)	100/222 (45%)
	Economically Disadvantaged	29/85 (34%)	31/87 (36%)	32/88 (36%)
	Students With Disabilities	1/24 (4%)	2/21 (10%)	3/23 (13%)
	English Language Learners	8/26 (31%)	7/24 (29%)	9/30 (30%)

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	12	25	24	19	30	32	10	29			
ELL	42	55	40	39	48	50	29	64	67		
ASN	76	60		80	65		71	90	79		
BLK	50	49	42	36	38	41	40	64	48		
HSP	52	50	34	51	39	38	44	61	74		
MUL	45			64							

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
WHT	61	50	29	57	40	47	69	70	79		
FRL	43	41	32	43	38	41	40	49	72		
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	21	40	35	23	32	30	18	38			
ELL	31	49	46	33	41	39	29	52	82		
ASN	75	64		81	69		83	82	93		
BLK	50	58	38	45	45	45	45	73	78		
HSP	52	56	48	50	49	44	54	72	79		
MUL	79	71		64	57						
WHT	61	56	39	67	50	30	56	83	88		
FRL	47	52	43	49	47	42	46	70	76		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	36	26	24	30	24	32	34			
ELL	14	38	43	25	37	33	22	34			
ASN	71	49		78	60		91	65	95		
BLK	42	41	38	40	44	32	49	69	70		
HSP	49	47	41	49	46	38	53	60	83		
MUL	87	65		70	76				83		
WHT	63	52	42	63	51	72	76	64	89		
FRL	46	45	38	47	45	38	47	60	80		

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	500
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	93%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	74
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	55
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?

Schoolwide progress monitoring data indicates that 6th grade students showed improvement in proficiency in ELA and Math between the iReady BOY and EOY assessments (ELA +6%, Math +15%). 7th Grade students showed a decline in ELA, but an increase in Math overall (ELA -9%, Math +9%). 8th students remained consistent in ELA (53% proficiency) and showed improvement in Math (+10%) overall. For the Civics PMA's, students showed a steady decline in proficiency from 74% to 66% overall. Science PMA scores were trending upward from 39% to 45% overall. Algebra 1 PMA scores showed steady improvement in proficiency with the 7th grade students (89% to 95%) outperforming the 8th grade students (66% to 77%). Students taking the Geometry PMA's showed the greatest improvement in proficiency moving from 59% to 86%. Students with disabilities (SWD) showed the lowest proficiency across content areas with 8th Grade Math being the lowest (0/21 students proficient on i-Ready EOY)

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

Grade level data indicates that 7th Grade ELA (declined from 50% to 41% between i-Ready BOY and EOY assessments) and 7th Grade Civics (declined from 74% to 66% between PMA 1 and PMA 3) demonstrated the greatest need for improvement.

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

Progress monitoring data indicated that the majority of the low performing students were receiving instruction via the LaunchEd platform. A LaunchEd Tutoring Plan was implemented to provide targeted students with additional intervention and support through virtual instruction for one additional hour after school Monday through Friday with certified teachers. Students complete i-Ready assessments at the end of a tutoring cycle to monitor for success of the intervention. Progress was communicated to teachers and parents.

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

Grade level data indicates that 6th Grade Math (improved from 39% to 54% between i-Ready BOY and EOY assessments) and Geometry students (improved from 59% to 86% between PMA 1 and PMA 3) showed the most improvement.

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

Collaboration, Engagement, Small Group Instruction, Questioning
Increase in collaboration and engagement (breakout rooms)
Increase in higher order questioning (resources provided, text and videos)
HOT text-dependent questions in ELA
Feedback: Emails, informal discussions, PLC discussions and notes

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

Planning and Data Chats during weekly PLC meetings
MTSS: Tier 2 and Tier 3 notes
Teacher-Student Data Chats
Bi-Weekly Classroom Walks w/Specific Look-For (CP walk through form)
Weekly Meetings with Coaches to review progress monitoring activities
Monthly meeting with Americorps tutors
Quarterly Grade Level Data Review/Planning Days

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.

ELL Instructional Strategies
Swivl (voluntary)
Culturally Responsive Instruction
SEL Sessions
Rotational Model

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

ELA: School-generated intervention curricula based off CRM texts, LAFS/MAFS resources, Teacher Toolbox, Performance Coach, NewsELA, ReadWorks
Math: Math Nation, Math XL, CRMs, Teacher Toolbox, Performance Coach, IXL
Science: CRM Reviews, Standards-based lessons, Study Island, Discovery Education, Explore Learning Gizmos
Civics: iCivics

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Goal: To increase learning gains and lowest 25% performance and proficiency in SWD in Math, ELA, Science, and Social Studies.
 Rationale: SWD have been performing below 32% in terms of their ESSA federal index for school years 2018 and 2019 (two consecutive years).
 OCPS Strategic Plan 2025: High Expectations for Student Learning
 KPI: Close the Achievement Gap- Decrease the amount of schools identified for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) due to low-performing subgroups

The intended outcome is to increase student achievement, learning gains, and learning gains of the lowest 25% of SWD.

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities: 30
 Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? YES
 Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% 2

ELA Achievement: 2019 Results (21%), 2021 Projected Increase +19 (40%)
 ELA Learning Gains: 2019 Results (40%), 2021 Projected Increase +5 (45%)
 ELA LG L25%: 2019 Results (35%), 2021 Projected Increase +5 (40%)

Measurable Outcome: Math Achievement: 2019 Results (23%), 2021 Projected Increase +20 (43%)
 Math Learning Gains: 2019 Results (32%), 2021 Projected Increase +8 (40%)
 Math LG L25%: 2019 Results (30%), 2021 Projected Increase +10 (40%)

Science: 2019 Results (18%), 2021 Projected Increase +20 (38%)
 Social Studies: 2019 Results (38%), 2021 Projected Increase +4 (42%)

Overall Performance: 2019 Results 237/800= 30%, Need 91 points, 2021 Goal 328/800= 41%

The SWD subgroup will show a five percentage point increase in ELA proficiency for 2022 when compared to the 2021 FSA data.

Administrators and leadership team members will conduct bi-weekly classroom walks to obtain low-inference data on effective instruction. We will also have data chats with teachers to analyze the effective use of data, foster open communication and consistency, determine how standards mastery is being addressed, and engage in next step conversations focused on the implementation and monitoring of:

Monitoring: Supports for our students with disabilities:
 -Support Facilitation
 -Learning Strategies Class
 -Small Group Instruction

Interventions for our students with disabilities:
 -Intensive Reading Class
 -Weekly Check-In (data chat)
 -AmeriCorps classroom assistant
 -Spiral Review
 -Math Counts- Lunch Edition

Person responsible for Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will use common formative and summative assessments data to identify interventions and re-teach standards for which mastery has not been met. PLCs will use UNIFY and CRMs assessments. Instructional coaches will monitor data and the use of assessments throughout the year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Common assessments on the same standards will be given by two or more teachers with the intention of examining the results. Some goals of examining these common assessments are to have teachers discuss and analyze their question-writing style and content, individual plans for student success, and an opportunity to look at what modifications need to be made during curriculum planning and classroom instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will collaborate with a leadership team member during PLC to create and examine assessments for rigor, reliability and the inclusion of the assessment components: question types, assessment length, complexity levels, and clearly written directions (every two to three weeks).

Person Responsible Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)

When creating the assessments, grade-level and content area teams will agree on what students will need to know to demonstrate mastery for each unit. This will occur prior to each unit (every two to three weeks).

Person Responsible Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)

When planning units, grade-level and content area teams will address PLC questions (every Thursday during PLC) with a focus on instruction, assessment, intervention and enrichment. This will occur prior to each unit (every two to three weeks).

Person Responsible Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)

Administrators will meet with department teams to analyze data, determine how standards mastery is being addressed, and next steps regarding target interventions or extension of learning opportunities for students who have reached mastery (every month).

Person Responsible Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students.
Description and Rationale: Rationale: Academic learning is enhanced when students and parents have opportunities to build meaningful relationships with teachers and other students. Students with meaningful connections at school will be more engaged, attend school more often, and interact positively with others to make meaningful connections to subject material.

Measurable Outcome: 1. Improvement in Early Systems Warning indicator data
 2. Panorama survey data
 3. Cognia survey data
 4. Anticipated impact of culture and climate on student achievement

Monitoring: Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. We will continue to use SAFE, PASS, and restorative practices to build and maintain meaningful relationships between school personnel, teachers, and students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change.
 Resources/Criteria: Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model, our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

SAFE coordinator, instructional coaches, and school personnel will plan and implement cycles of professional development to provide training and opportunities for safe practice around social and emotional learning (every semester).

Person Responsible Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)

Deans, SAFE coordinator, PASS coordinator, and school personnel will use restorative justice protocols and social skills lessons where appropriate to reduce the early warning indicator of student suspensions (weekly).

Person Responsible Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)

Administration, school psychologist, social worker, SAFE coordinator, Deans, and school personnel will review attendance and suspension data with a focus on creating action plans to engage students and parents in school (weekly).

Person Responsible Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)

Instructional coaches will support teachers to develop and implement strategies for establishing a culture of social and emotional learning with students (every two to three weeks).

Person Responsible Beatriz Smith (beatriz.smith@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), 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.

Using the Safe Schools for Alex data, Odyssey is ranked high for reported discipline incidents. We are showing an average of 4 incidents per 100 students; thus a total of about 32 incidents compared to other schools district/statewide. Our most recent data from 2019 show that we had 103 in-school suspensions and 38 out of school suspensions. Our data has shown quite a bit of improvement (mainly compared to the 2 prior years); our culture and our support staff work hard to ensure that our students are entering a safe and nurturing environment and the application of updated rules and procedures (especially consistency) will truly help us to continue to show improvements for the 2021-2022 school year.

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.

At Odyssey Middle School we establish a positive school culture and climate by engaging in ongoing professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, we use social emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through professional learning, we use 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. We've implemented a

Student Ambassador Program to establish and maintain positive relationships with students and staff. Students will meet with the leadership team to address student concerns, issues, needs and serve as a voice to our student population and engage in the decision making process. We've implemented SODAS (define the situation, examine options available to deal with the problem, determine the disadvantages and advantages of each option, decide on a solution) problem solving strategies during Restorative Justice Circles and counseling sessions to teach students how to resolve conflicts.

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

Here at Odyssey we have a core team of teachers and administrators, which includes the mental health designee, attend the district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on our school and community needs. Our school leadership team collaborates with SAC and PTSA to discuss and develop opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$3,115.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6150	399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	1682 - Odyssey Middle	Other		\$3,115.00
			<i>Notes: HERO Teacher/Parent communication software to track positive behavior, discipline issues, and student attendance</i>			
					Total:	\$3,115.00