

Orange County Public Schools

Timber Springs Middle



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Timber Springs Middle

16001 TIMBER PARK LN, Orlando, FL 32828

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

Demographics

Principal: Steven Soubasis

Start Date for this Principal: 1/16/2017

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (66%) 2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: B (61%)
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	ATSI
* 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	13
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Timber Springs Middle

16001 TIMBER PARK LN, Orlando, FL 32828

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	49%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cantrell, Eric	Principal	<p>The principal is responsible for oversight of all curriculum and instruction which includes school operations. Budgeting and accounting is an area of responsibility where needs and constraints are assessed in order to adequately fund instructional initiatives aimed at reducing achievement gaps and increasing learning gains. This includes SELL, scheduling, promoting instructional leadership, school and community relations, program planning, assessments, evaluations, school activities, and functions. In addition, the principal is responsible for enforcement of district-wide policies, guidelines and procedures. The principal oversees school-wide progress monitoring and student data in an effort to close achievement gaps for student sub-populations; ad facilitates and supports professional learning community groups within the school (PLC). The principal monitors instructional staff to ensure effective instructional strategies are consistently implemented in all classrooms. School and community stakeholders are communicated with regularly regarding the academic initiatives and progress of our students.</p>
Soubasis, Steven	Assistant Principal	<p>Assistant Principal: Mr. Soubasis is responsible for curriculum and instruction, for devising and implementing the master schedule. Facilitating PLCs and MTSS/Data meetings with the Math Department. Evaluating instructional staff is another area of responsibility to ensure effective instructional strategies are consistently implemented in all classrooms. Communication with school and community stakeholders regularly is key to engaging and involving parents and community members regarding academic initiatives and progress of our students.</p>
Parsons, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	<p>Assistant Principal: Mrs. Parsons is charged with oversight of school operations. She facilitates PLCs and MTSS/ Data meetings with the Social Studies Department. The assistant principal evaluates instructional staff to ensure effective instructional strategies are consistently implemented in all classrooms. Mrs. Parsons communicates with school and community stakeholders regularly regarding the academic initiatives and progress of our students.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Shepherd, Natalie	Dean	Dean: Ms. Shepherd is responsible for overseeing schoolwide positive behavior plan and discipline. Facilitating PLCs and MTSS/Data meetings with the Science Department is another area where the Dean is involved. Ms. Shepherd will be working in PLCs, PDs, staff meetings, and data meetings to share not only discipline data, but to support teachers academically as well as with student behavioral concerns that may impact learning. She will help coach teachers who need support with classroom management, and she will support the MTSS Tier 1 & 2 behavioral concerns which includes working with community members.
Grullon, Laura	Other	SAFE Coordinator: Ms. Grullon will support and monitor mental health and SEL initiatives for our students in an effort to better meet their needs. Ms. Grullon will support our deans and counselors to build a community where students are safe, and are able to come to her with any concerns.
Stella, Elizabeth	School Counselor	Ms. Stella will support all students academic, emotional, and life needs. She will teach character education, teen safety matters, college and career readiness, and support behavior interventions. She will also be in charge of 6th grade 504's.
Craft, Linda	Other	Staffing Specialist: Ms. Craft participates in MTSS meetings to ensure proper focus and interventions are being implemented with additional support services as well as for ESE students. She plays a primary role in individual Tier 3 student meetings to determine the appropriateness of initiating ESE an evaluation. Ms. Craft will take care of our students with an IEP (ESE) or EP (Gifted), or 504 Plan. She supports the MTSS process and ensures students receive facilitated support to better meet their educational needs. Mrs. Craft works closely with all teachers, and leadership to identify and provide support services to students who may have specific needs because of the MTSS

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		process, or that is relative to their specific staffing classification and/or placement.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 1/16/2017, Steven Soubasis

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

65

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,010

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

9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

15

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/25/2022

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	284	319	304	0	0	0	0	907
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	16	20	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	8	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	16	45	0	0	0	0	71
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	20	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	35	42	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	30	51	0	0	0	0	104
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	35	42	0	0	0	0	105

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	23	30	51	0	0	0	0	104

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	284	319	304	0	0	0	0	907
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	16	20	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	8	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	16	45	0	0	0	0	71
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	20	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	35	42	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	30	51	0	0	0	0	104
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	35	42	0	0	0	0	105

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	23	30	51	0	0	0	0	104

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	58%	49%	50%				68%	52%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	54%						61%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						49%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	71%	36%	36%				75%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	73%						67%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%						58%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	55%	53%				65%	51%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	77%	61%	58%				82%	67%	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	2022					
	2019	68%	52%	16%	54%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	65%	48%	17%	52%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
08	2022					
	2019	68%	54%	14%	56%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	70%	43%	27%	55%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	68%	49%	19%	54%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
08	2022					
	2019	52%	36%	16%	46%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	63%	49%	14%	48%	15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	81%	66%	15%	71%	10%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	95%	63%	32%	61%	34%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	19	47	41	33	65	59	13	35			
ELL	41	50	50	58	66	55	29	61	75		
ASN	78	67		96	88		82	100	100		
BLK	48	51	42	64	72	67	48	77	79		
HSP	52	50	43	62	69	62	59	65	82		
MUL	64	59		84	82						
WHT	63	57	46	78	76	73	69	85	92		
FRL	47	49	43	59	69	64	46	62	88		
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	8	30	28	14	37	35	17	48	33		
ELL	26	43	39	31	40	46	16	46	73		
ASN	83	65		90	60		92	93	98		
BLK	58	53	35	53	38	23	56	69	62		
HSP	52	50	39	52	43	43	53	77	77		
MUL	71	33		72	30		74	80	90		
WHT	64	53	42	69	46	28	61	79	80		
FRL	48	47	37	49	38	36	49	68	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	30	41	32	41	58	58	27	60			
ELL	47	55	45	60	66	56	40	60	83		
ASN	82	68	64	93	79		83	96	97		
BLK	64	55	54	65	58	39	63	84	75		
HSP	62	61	50	70	68	62	55	77	78		
MUL	94	79		92	62		91		82		
WHT	71	59	35	80	67	59	72	84	88		
FRL	59	59	45	66	62	55	52	74	78		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
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	31
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	626
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

ELA:

1. ELA proficiency dropped 2% from 2021
2. ELA Learning gains has increased 2% from 2021
3. ELA B25 increase 6% from 2021
4. 17 students dropped 2 achievement levels
5. 176 students dropped 1 achievement level
6. 407 students achieved the same achievement level
7. 180 students increased 1 achievement level
8. 16 students increased 2 achievement levels

Math:

1. Math proficiency increase 9% from 2021
2. Math Learning gains has increase 29% from 2021
3. Math B25 increase 30% from 2021

Other Areas:

1. Science increase 3% from 2021
2. Civics dropped 1% from 2021
3. Acceleration increase 8% from 2021

Overall:

1. TSMS overall school grade increase 9% from 2021

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our greatest need for improvement is closing achievement gaps with our B25, level 1, and level 2 students.

In reviewing the data all of our standard classes, level 1 and level 2 students, (with the exception of 2 teachers) under performed regarding achieving proficiency in ELA, Math, SS, and Science.

407 student in ELA maintained their learning level with no level increase or drop

- 109 /153 level 1s 71%
- 84/198 level 2s 42%
- 83/188 level 3s 44%
- 76 / 183 level 4s 42%
- 55 /91 level 5 60%

ELA Level 1 Students:

- 153 Students earned a level 1 in 2021
- 109 / 153 71% maintained a level 1 proficiency
- 34/153 22% improved 1 achievement level (not proficiency but made learning gain)
- 4/153 .03% improved 2 achievement levels (showed proficiency)

ELA Level 2 Students:

- 198 Students earned a level 2 in 2021
- 47/198 24% dropped 1 achievement level
- 84/198 42% maintained a level 1 proficiency
- 55/198 28% improved 1 achievement level (showed proficiency)
- 8/198 .04% improved 2 achievement levels (showed proficiency)

Math:

1. Math proficiency increase 9% from 2021
2. Math Learning gains has increase 29% from 2021
3. Math B25 increase 30% from 2021

Other Areas:

1. Science increase 3% from 2021
2. Civics dropped 1% from 2021
3. Acceleration increase 8% from 2021

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

Contributing factors to this need for improvement are: support for scaffolding, inconsistent support / interventions due to staffing shortages, classroom management / discipline, inconsistent communication with parents / guardians, limited student participation in tutoring.

The new actions that need to be taken to address this need:

- Staff PD on proven strategies that support our non-proficient students. Modeling of strategies.
- Strong systems / procedures for interventionist and support. (Acceleration in math / scaffolded supports using i-Ready in ELA, updated MTSS systems and tracking support, schedules for interventionist, clear roles and expectations for supports in ELA and Math, SMART goals, strategic scheduling/ class assignments.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data components that showed the most improvement in 2022 were the math learning gains (+29%) and math B25 learning gains (+30).

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

The new actions and contributing factors to this improvement were: structured PLCs and planning, additional planning days, effective tutoring and push-in and pull-out supports.

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

Increased use of Kagan strategies.

Effective use of scaffolding.

Quarterly data chats.

Targeted intervention styles: acceleration in math vs differentiated supports in ELA

SMART Goals

Consistent observer feedback

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.

Kagan

Engagement Strategies / Classroom Management

Recognizing learning styles / Scaffolding

Teacher / Intervention interactions and support (what does it look and sound like)

Teacher Modeling

Analyzing and Implementing formative and summative data. (On the spot interventions).

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

We have added 6 team members, into the role of interventionists, for the purpose of supporting targeted students to reach achievement in ELA and Math.

We have reevaluated and updated our MTSS process and procedures for the 22-23 school year.

We have reevaluated and updated our tutoring process and procedures for the 22-23 school year.

Quarterly data chats with tested content areas.

Updated leadership matrix.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on our data, ELA is under performing in regard to proficiency and learning gains; based on historical data and schoolwide goals.

- ELA proficiency dropped 10pts from 2019 to 2022
- ELA proficiency dropped 2pt from 2021 to 2022
- ELA learning gains dropped 7pts from 2019 to 2022
- ELA learning gains increased 2pts from 2021 to 2022
- ELA B25 learning gains dropped 3pt from 2019 to 2022
- ELA B25 increased 6pts from 2021 to 2022

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

- Increase ELA proficiency by 5pts to 63% in 2023.
- Maintain proficiency for 100% of students, in 2023, who earned a level 3 or higher in 2022.
- 60% of level 2 students will make learning gains and earn proficiency of a level 3 or higher, in 2023 (approx. 120 students)

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

- Progress Monitoring through FAST, formative assessments, summative assessments.
- Progress Monitoring utilizing i-Ready for targeted students: level 1 and level 2
- Interventionists push-ins / pull-outs monitored through weekly support logs and data chats.
- MTSS tracking, monthly meetings, data analysis
- Tiered teacher / interventionist supports in ELA (coaching support, model teaching)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eric Cantrell (eric.cantrell@ocps.net)

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

Increased / maintained proficiency on progress monitoring data (FAST, formative assessments, summative assessment, i-Ready for targeted students) through the use of Kagan strategies, scaffolded push-in and pull-out support, and actionable feedback for teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Kagan structures are research based as well as supported at the state and district level. Kagan structures and strategies have proven themselves as effective teaching and learning tools for cooperative learning, engaging multiple intelligences, language learning, etc.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Ongoing Professional Development in Kagan strategies. (Monthly)

Person Responsible

Kimberly Parsons (kimberly.parsons@ocps.net)

Data driven intervention groups, clear goals for interventionists, intervention logs, consistent data monitoring for effective practices.

Person Responsible

Steven Soubasis (steven.soubasis@ocps.net)

Instructional coach will meet with individual teachers to plan support for tier 2 and 3 instruction, including students with disabilities.

Person Responsible

Kimberly Parsons (kimberly.parsons@ocps.net)

Classroom observations continue to support teachers who may need time to implement feedback, conduct new coaching recommendations to see the effectiveness of Kagan strategies.

Person Responsible Eric Cantrell (eric.cantrell@ocps.net)

Tutoring programs will be implemented to support students needs and close achievement gaps.

Person Responsible Steven Soubasis (steven.soubasis@ocps.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students.
 Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject materials. By ensuring our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:
 Professional development for teachers relating to acceptance, tolerance, and diversity (Cultural Responsiveness and SEL).
 Stakeholder buy-in (i.e. students, staff, parents)

TSMS will use the following to determine the effectiveness of social emotional learning incorporated throughout our school:

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

Improvement in Early Warning Systems indicator data which includes student achievement for those in the lowest quartile for ELA/Reading (58% to 63%) and Math (71% to 77%) with attendance and discipline as our primary areas of focus.

100% participation with Cognia and school-based surveys with emphasis on increasing community involvement, increased communication, and effective strategies being used to monitor progress.

Decreased disciplinary infractions/consequences.

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome through actions plans developed by the leadership team, student data monitoring and classroom instructional monitoring, student support regarding early warning indicators, and survey monitoring. Student data will be monitored by the classroom teacher, PLCS, instructional coaches, and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Parsons (kimberly.parsons@ocps.net)

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

Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. 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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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

Action Steps to Implement

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

Use cycles of professional learning that integrate academics and social and emotional learning

Person Responsible Natalie Shepherd (natalie.shepherd@ocps.net)

Monitor student attendance and discipline daily.

Person Responsible Natalie Shepherd (natalie.shepherd@ocps.net)

Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts.

Person Responsible Eric Cantrell (eric.cantrell@ocps.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

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

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

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

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, TSMS engages in ongoing, districtwide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, TSMS uses the 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. A core team of teachers and administrators from TSMS, which include a mental health designee, attend this 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 school

stakeholders, based on school and community needs. The school leadership team collaborates with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy.