# Oak Park Middle School



# 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Oak Park Middle School

## 2101 SOUTH ST, Leesburg, FL 34748

### https://oms.lake.k12.fl.us//

## Demographics

## Principal: Tammy Langley                          Start Date for this Principal: 8/23/2022

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Middle School<br>6-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an 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 Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: C (42%)<br><br>2018-19: C (42%)<br><br>2017-18: C (46%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Central |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Lucinda Thompson |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | TSI |
| * 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 Lake 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.](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

# Oak Park Middle School

## 2101 SOUTH ST, Leesburg, FL 34748

### https://oms.lake.k12.fl.us//

## 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 | Yes | 100% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 76% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | C | | C | C |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake 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.**

Our Mission at Oak Park Middle School is to provide a caring and supportive atmosphere so that students can reach their fullest potential by supplying a safe, orderly, and academically rich environment.

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

At Oak Park Middle School we have a positive and supportive school culture where we believe in our students, we believe in ourselves, we believe in each other, and we believe in our 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Langley, Tammy | Principal | Casts the vision and leads the mission. Leads the leadership team. Ensures FTE accountability. Coaches and assesses the ELA teachers and some ESE teachers, the leadership team and administrators. |
| Strickland, Joella | Assistant Principal | Provides behavioral education and discipline for 7th graders. Leads for PBIS on campus. Leads and facilitates 7th grade grade-level meetings. Coaches and assesses the Math and Science teachers. |
| Gomez, Frank | Assistant Principal | Ensures all students are scheduled into a needed intervention for just-in-time support, retention prevention, multi-level progress towards on-grade-level achievement, or acceleration. Provides behavioral education and discipline for 8th graders, helps to lead and facilitate 8th grade grade-level meetings, coaches and assesses the Social Studies and most elective teachers. Leads for School Safety. Leads for TIST. Provides training for new teachers (new to teaching, new the Lake County, new to Oak Park). |
| Munoz, Itnery | Dean | Supports the admin team by handing behavioral education and discipline for 6th graders, helps to facilitate and lead our 6th grade teachers' grade level meetings, champions school safety, and helps to coach our teachers in best practices. |
| Gawenda, Heather O. | Instructional Coach | Champion literacy on our campus through trainings, data analysis, coaching all of our teachers to ensure reading, writing, and talking about thinking happens for our students every day in the castle. |
| Wendt@Lake.K12.fl.us, Mark | Other | Represent and speak for the mental health needs of our students, faculty, and staff. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Tuesday 8/23/2022, Tammy Langley

**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**

46

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

564

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

5

**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 | 182 | 171 | 176 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 529 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 | 82 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 290 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 41 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 70 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 199 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 70 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 200 |
| 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 | 146 | 131 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 411 |

**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 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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

Tuesday 8/23/2022

**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 | 174 | 164 | 167 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 505 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 275 |

**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 | 174 | 164 | 167 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 505 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 140 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 275 |

**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 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

## 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 | 33% | 45% | 50% | | | | 35% | 50% | 54% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 38% | | | | | | 45% | 52% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 34% | | | | | | 34% | 44% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | 31% | 33% | 36% | | | | 32% | 56% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 40% | | | | | | 39% | 55% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 41% | | | | | | 35% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 36% | 50% | 53% | | | | 31% | 49% | 51% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 54% | 54% | 58% | | | | 68% | 70% | 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 | 36% | 52% | -16% | 54% | -18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 32% | 49% | -17% | 52% | -20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -36% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 32% | 54% | -22% | 56% | -24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -32% | | | | |

| | | | | MATH | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 36% | 53% | -17% | 55% | -19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 34% | 58% | -24% | 54% | -20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -36% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 14% | 39% | -25% | 46% | -32% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -34% | | | | |

| | | | | 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 | 30% | 49% | -19% | 48% | -18% |
| 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 | 66% | 71% | -5% | 71% | -5% |
| 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 | 61% | 52% | 9% | 61% | 0% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

## 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 | 13 | 32 | 33 | 13 | 31 | 28 | 18 | 26 | | | |
| ELL | 32 | 67 | | 19 | 47 | 54 | 17 | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 32 | 19 | 18 | 35 | 40 | 17 | 38 | 36 | | |
| HSP | 34 | 46 | 53 | 33 | 44 | 43 | 40 | 62 | 69 | | |
| MUL | 36 | 35 | | 39 | 46 | | 27 | 64 | | | |
| WHT | 40 | 38 | 53 | 41 | 39 | 39 | 54 | 62 | 74 | | |
| FRL | 29 | 37 | 34 | 27 | 39 | 40 | 26 | 51 | 60 | | |
| 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 | 3 | 25 | 33 | 5 | 35 | 42 | 20 | 32 | | | |
| ELL | 38 | 44 | | 32 | 52 | | | 50 | | | |
| BLK | 18 | 33 | 33 | 15 | 32 | 42 | 11 | 43 | 54 | | |

| 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 |
| HSP | 41 | 49 | 43 | 38 | 46 | 33 | 45 | 67 | 61 | | |
| MUL | 26 | 35 | | 27 | 32 | | 50 | | | | |
| WHT | 48 | 47 | 42 | 46 | 51 | 54 | 47 | 59 | 76 | | |
| FRL | 30 | 38 | 35 | 28 | 40 | 42 | 32 | 46 | 62 | | |

| 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 | 12 | 29 | 24 | 13 | 28 | 25 | 3 | 45 | | | |
| ELL | 32 | 50 | 30 | 32 | 52 | 54 | | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 36 | 31 | 18 | 33 | 33 | 17 | 65 | 44 | | |
| HSP | 28 | 47 | 31 | 27 | 40 | 42 | 16 | 58 | | | |
| MUL | 38 | 50 | | 38 | 46 | | 58 | 79 | | | |
| WHT | 48 | 49 | 41 | 46 | 39 | 29 | 47 | 73 | 63 | | |
| FRL | 30 | 42 | 36 | 27 | 36 | 35 | 25 | 63 | 44 | | |

## 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) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 42 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 374 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 96% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 24 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 3 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 39 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |

| English Language Learners | |
|---|---|
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Black/African American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 29 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 47 |
| 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 | 41 |
| 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 | 49 |
| 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 | 38 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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?**

The trends that emerge across the board are lower than district average scores in achievement in every tested category. There was a drop in score in every ELA and Math school grade area from 2021 to 2022. ELA Achievement dropped from 35 to 33. ELA Learning Gains dropped from 42 to 38. ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains dropped from 37 to 34. Math Achievement dropped from 33 to 31. Math Learning Gains dropped from 42 to 40. Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains dropped from 42 to 41. This is a trend that, although reads on the table from the top downward, should be looked at from the bottom upwards. When Lowest Quartile Learning Gains drop percentage points, every tested category will fall. When those learning gains rise, Achievement will rise.

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

ELA Achievement and Math Achievement demonstrate great need for improvement. In order for these to go up, learning gains are necessary. A focus on Lowest Quartile Learning Gains, and then Learning Gains overall will cause all tested areas to increase in point value. These drops were evident across all subgroups. In our subgroups, Students with Disabilities suffered drops in Math Learning Gains, Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains, Science Achievement, and Social Studies Achievement. ELL students suffered drops in ELA Achievement, Math Achievement, and Math Learning Games. Black students suffered drops of 1 point in ELA Learning Gains, 14 points in ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains, 2 points in Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains, 5 points in Social Studies Achievement, and 18 points in Middle School Acceleration. Free/Reduced Lunch qualifying students suffered drops of 1 point in ELA Achievement, 1 point in ELA Learning Gains, 1 point in Lowest Quartile ELA Learning Gains, 1 point in Math Achievement, 1 point in Math Learning Gains, 2 points in Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains, 6 points in Science Achievement, and 2 points in Middle School Acceleration. White students dropped eight (8) points in ELA Achievement, 9 points in ELA Learning Gains, 5 points in Math Achievement, 12 points in Math Learning Gains, and 15 points in Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains. In Middle School data, when ELA achievement improves, there is a correlative improvement in Social Studies and Science Achievement. When Math Achievement improves, there is a correlative improvement shown in Acceleration 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?**

Coming off of the two greatest COVID pandemic interrupted years, the 2021-2022 school year began with more mass quarantines, continued dismissiveness regarding student attendance, and teacher shortages that led to long-term subs or teachers covering subjects for which those teachers were not certified or highly qualified. Non-highly qualified teachers covering core-subjects and the corresponding

intervention blocks leads to unfocused intervention. Inconsistent student attendance leads to a lack of consistency with an intervention. When intervention is unstructured, unfocused, and inconsistent, we will most likely see sharp drops in Learning Gains and Lowest Quartile Learning Gains. More consistent and focused EWS meetings and reviews will help us to hone in on all attendance concerns and help in the areas we are able. Student work and tasks given to students need to be focused completely on the learning expected of them for their grade level. Our resources, SAI, Title I, and others must be aligned and targeted. Offering before or after school tutoring opportunities is also necessary.

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

Science Achievement and Social Studies Achievement each gained one point compared to 2021, raising from 35 to 36, and 53 to 54 respectively. These were the two areas on the table that showed improvement.

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

Social Studies achievement scores come from the 7th Grade Civics EOC. There was a push to further sharpen the focus on Teacher Clarity, especially students' knowledge of the 'What?", "Why?", and "How?". As a department, beginning to understand the power behind guided instruction unlocked higher levels of learning.

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

In order to accelerate learning we will collectively sharpen our structure, focus, and consistency with our intervention/acceleration block, heretofore known as Knights Unite, or KU. While most sections will be focused on intervention, as our data demands, there will be some acceleration options available. Especially for our 8th grade students enrolled in Algebra Honors. They will need guidance and acceleration opportunities for their math knowledge. We will have a KU for them. We will implement a before school and after school tutoring program. Teachers will continue to receive professional development in the implementation of the Gradual Release of Responsibility instructional practice.

**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.**

Professional development opportunities will be centered around inclusionary practices, the Gradual Release of Responsibility framework, formative assessments and data analysis (continuous improvement model). Teachers will also be provided the weekly opportunity to collaborate within Professional Learning Teams or Common Planning.

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

In order to focus students academically homeroom has been added four times a week with attention given to restorative practices and organization. Students who have been retained will be provided a mentor to support monitoring of their progress. Classroom learning walks will be conducted to monitor and provide feedback to teachers regarding instructional practices and transfer to student learning. In order to solidify our learning and make concrete plans for continued implementation we will select teacher leaders to participate in Summer Writing Teams who will make plans based on all we have learned this year.

**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 Standards-aligned Instruction | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Our focus on Modeling Thinking and Guided Instruction directly corresponds to two areas on the gradual release model presented on our district's Instructional Framework. Our drops in ELA and Math learning gains referenced in the data analysis show a need to focus on these evidenced-based strategies. We will provide professional development in those areas for our teachers during their common planning times and other times as available. In our data from learning walks over the previous years, students are understanding the purpose regularly. While this data will continue to be collected through the district's Learning Walk Tool, our school will focus on Modeling and Guided Instruction. These instructional practices are very powerful according to John Hattie's meta-analysis presented in Visible Learning. After focusing on Purpose for multiple years our teachers can pass that knowledge on to new teachers. Specific focus is needed in order to move our teachers into proficiency with Modeling Thinking and Guided Instruction. |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | As we focus on these instructional practices we should see, in the district's Learning Walk Tool, evidence of greater usage of Guided Instruction; modeling; questioning, prompting, cuing; and checks for understanding. We expect to see gains of at least 3 points in achievement across all tested areas, gains of at least 3 points in learning gains and gains of at least 3 points in bottom quartile learning gains. |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | The measurable outcome of this area of focus will be monitored through student results through the use of FAST 1 and FAST 2 as well LSAs at Q1, Mid-Year, and Q3. We will be looking at our bottom quartile students and looking for gains as well as all of our students and the gains they are projecting. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Tammy Langley (langleyt@lake.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being** | The evidence based strategy we are implementing is modeling and guided instruction. Our focus on Modeling and Guided Instruction assumes the modeling and guided instruction is being used on standards-aligned lessons and tasks. Standards-aligned instruction ensures all students are receiving a quality education by design and not by chance. Every teacher in every class should be focused on standard-aligned instruction. |

**implemented for this Area of Focus.**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**
Modeling and Guided Instruction is the area in which the greatest "Teacher Moves" are implemented during a lesson. And Instruction that is not aligned to standards is a waste of time, our most precious resource. Ensuring the instruction on our campus is aligned to approved standards is paramount. We will monitor how this strategy is being implemented by our teachers through the learning walk tool dashboard. We will look at trends concerning the use of modeling, guided instruction, and its hallmarks (questing, prompting, cueing; wait time, 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.

Schedule and ensure regular Learning Walks by administration and leadership team

**Person Responsible**  Tammy Langley (langleyt@lake.k12.fl.us)

Review data collected via the district's Learning Walk Tool

**Person Responsible**  Tammy Langley (langleyt@lake.k12.fl.us)

Review data collected from FAST 1, FAST 2, and LSAs.

**Person Responsible**  Tammy Langley (langleyt@lake.k12.fl.us)

| #2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Signs | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | In this area of focus we will ensure high expectations, build relationships with stakeholders, develop collective efficacy, and recruit/retain highly qualified and effective staff. This is of vital importance in order to create and sustain a positive school culture that can pass itself on to new members (new teachers and staff, new students, new families) seamlessly. Ensuring high expectations has been identified as a critical need due to low performance in academic reporting categories, high rates of referrals and suspensions, old and unknown PBIS messaging, and an expectation that facilities will look old, dirty, and be in disrepair. Building relationships is important to maintain positive behavior among students and retain highly qualified teachers and staff. Developing collective efficacy is vital to a school's success in every way as John Hattie regularly identifies it in his meta-analyses of Visible Learning as the most effective strategy related to school improvement. The classroom teacher is most important variable in education. Recruiting and retaining the best available is of utmost importance. |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | Discipline referrals will decrease for the school overall, especially class of 2027 (8th Graders) who have been in the school for 3 years and this year's 6th graders (Class of 2029) compared to last year's 6th graders (Class of 2028). A focus on Early Warning Signs will also decrease the number of retentions and the number of students showing 2 or more Early Warning Signs. |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Discipline Data will be reviewed at Admin and Leadership meetings. EWS data will be reviewed at EWS meetings. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Joella Strickland (stricklandj@lake.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being** | The monitoring of specific Early Warning Signs can help a school community target specific students for specific interventions before it is too late. A strong, healthy Tier One of academic, behavioral, and teacher support is the most powerful function of a positive school culture. With a strong Tier One, a school's EWS team can be confident that when a student or a teacher is falling short of desired outcomes, it is time for Tier Two interventions to be implemented. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **implemented for this Area of Focus.** | |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | This strategy was selected due to overwhelming data showing that rising referral rates and suspension rates were negatively impacting student achievement. The behaviors and the discipline chosen might be the cause of gaps in knowledge for our students. |

## Action Steps to Implement

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

Create, with teacher leaders, a clear and highly structured, highly supported PBIS plan for student behavior at Oak Park Middle School.

| **Person Responsible** | Joella Strickland (stricklandj@lake.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

Present that clear, highly structured, highly supported PBIS plan for student behavior at Oak Park Middle School.

| **Person Responsible** | Joella Strickland (stricklandj@lake.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

Inspect and support that clear, highly structured PBIS plan for student behavior at Oak Park Middle School.

| **Person Responsible** | Joella Strickland (stricklandj@lake.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

Assist new teachers in understanding the culture and its expectations at Oak Park Middle School.

| **Person Responsible** | Frank Gomez (gomezf@lake.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

Assign mentors for new teachers

| **Person Responsible** | Frank Gomez (gomezf@lake.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

Meet with new teachers regularly in order to keep them up to date on what is expected at Oak Park Middle School

| **Person Responsible** | Frank Gomez (gomezf@lake.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | A focus on our instructional practices related to differentiation is necessary as shown by our student's data concerning learning gains being made by all students, and specifically our lowest quartile of performers in ELA and Math. Differentiating our outreach and interventions is a critical need if we are going to reach these students and bring them up to performing at grade level according to Florida BEST Standards. Our students with disabilities, ELL students, black/African American students, and economically disadvantaged students need to be the focus of our efforts, as evidenced by our ESSA Subgroup Data. |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | As an outcome of this area of focus, we will see increased achievement in each of our ESSA Subgroups with all of those subgroups performing at or above 41%. We will see increases in our learning gains and lowest quartile learning gains. |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | We will monitor this area of focus through our common assessment data and FAST 1, FAST 2, Q1 LSA, and Mid-Year LSA data. Any changes or updates that need to be made will be made at those times. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | [no one identified] |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | This is a schoolwide system of intervention and support. As new data becomes available we can update intervention rosters and offerings. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.** | This specific strategy is necessary as students' gaps in knowledge will be filled by the intervention and those students can move on to some other area where they may have gaps in knowledge. |

**Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

### 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.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

## 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.

Our school builds a positive school culture and environment through setting a clear vision, mission and collective agreements. Positive Behavior and Intervention Support (PBIS) is used to identify schoolwide expectations and values. Restorative Practices are used in homeroom to help teachers and students build healthy relationships and a sense of community. In addition, parent and community engagement is facilitated through various evening events, parent conferences, weekly call outs, and information shared on our social media platforms.

Extracurricular activities, clubs, and incentives are given out to celebrate successes. Stakeholders meet collaboratively to problem solve areas of concern and to share innovative ideas for school improvement.

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

The principal is responsible for casting a vision and reaching out to all stakeholders to take part in the vision and mission of the school. The principal encourages and nurtures those relationships with community members and stakeholders. The whole leadership team leads with the vision and mission as the main set of values considered in decision making. The leadership team inspects what is expected of faculty and staff. Administration holds all faculty and staff accountable to the vision and mission. Teachers and staff uphold vision, mission, values and goals through their participation and growth in the areas of focus outlined in this school improvement plan. Students commit to Silver Knight PRIDE - Politeness, Respect, Integrity, Discipline, and Effort. Families participate in parent involvement organizations such as SAC and PTO. If they are not able to participate at that level, parents support the vision and mission by providing support at home in any way they are able. They come to after school events as they are able and attend parent - teacher conferences when their attendance is requested. Our business partners and community organizations provide volunteers for reading to kids, provide rewards for students upholding our vision and mission, and supply various needs.