

Orange County Public Schools

Sunridge Middle



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Sunridge Middle

14955 SUNRIDGE BLVD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

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

Demographics

Principal: Amy Mchale

Start Date for this Principal: 6/27/2018

| | |
|--|---|
| 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) | 32% |
| 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 (69%) 2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (64%) |
| 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 | N/A |
| * 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 | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Sunridge Middle

14955 SUNRIDGE BLVD, Winter Garden, FL 34787

<https://sunridgems.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>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p> | <p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">32%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">49%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
| Grade | A | 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 |
|---------------------------|---------------------|--|
| McHale, Amy | Principal | Principal monitors math programs (including high school credit math classes), overall math achievement and "bubble" math students. Supports teachers by supporting Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and oversees implementation of interventions/support with students, conducts observations and provides growth feedback to educators. Leads planning and implementation of school initiatives as well as facilitating school improvement efforts, staffing, progress monitoring, MTSS, etc. |
| Anderson, Clinton | Assistant Principal | Monitors ELA programs, overall ELA achievement and "bubble" ELA students; Supports teachers by supporting Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and oversees implementation of interventions/support with students, conducts observations and provides growth feedback to educators. Assists in planning and implementation of school initiatives as well as facilitating school improvement efforts, staffing, progress monitoring, MTSS, etc. |
| Breaud, Melissa | Behavior Specialist | Monitors our ESE population of students, including ASD Units; Monitors overall achievement, attendance and supports and monitors behavior of SWD; Supports teachers by supporting Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and provides and implements of interventions/support with students, conducts observations and provides growth feedback to educators. Assists in planning and implementation of school initiatives as well as facilitating school improvement efforts, staffing, progress monitoring, MTSS, etc. |
| Mansier, Ann | Instructional Media | Media Specialist and Digital Instructional Coaching. Maintains digital inventory promotes literacy initiatives across campus. |
| Randall-Britten, Roneisha | Dean | Monitors overall achievement, attendance and supports and monitors behavior of 8th grade students through interventions/support with students, observations, feedback etc.; supports coordination of community outreach with school stakeholders; Supports teachers by supporting Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and provides and implements of interventions/support with students, conducts observations and provides growth feedback to educators. Assists in planning and implementation of school initiatives as well as facilitating school improvement efforts, staffing, progress monitoring, MTSS, etc. |
| Rochester, Catherine | School Counselor | Monitors overall achievement, attendance and supports and monitors behavior of students through interventions/support with students, observations, feedback etc.; Supports teachers by supporting Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and provides and implements of interventions/support with students, conducts observations and provides growth feedback to educators. Assists in planning and implementation of school initiatives as well as facilitating school improvement efforts, staffing, progress monitoring, MTSS, etc. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| Kingsley, Samantha | Other | Coordinating Testing and 504 |
| Foltz, Amber | Instructional Coach | Literacy Lead, New Teacher Mentor, Professional Development, ECS (ESOL) |
| Stanberry, Janise | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal of Operations- Discipline, PBIS, Facility and Energy Management Oversees Reading, Social Studies and CTE |
| Kushner, Kristen | Other | Student and Family Engagement Coordinator |
| Richards, Donald | Other | PASS Coordinator, Discipline support and classroom management resource teacher |
| Carr, Katherine | Staffing Specialist | ESE staffing specialist |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/27/2018, Amy Mchale

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.*

3

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.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

105

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,182

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

10

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

5

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 | 338 | 369 | 402 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1109 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 59 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 189 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 51 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 50 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 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 | 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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/27/2022

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 | 415 | 425 | 435 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1275 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 37 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 16 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 18 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 33 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 41 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 92 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 252 |

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 | 41 | 39 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 |

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 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

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 | 415 | 425 | 435 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1275 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 37 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 16 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 18 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 33 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 41 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 92 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 252 |

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 | 41 | 39 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 |

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 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 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 | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 69% | 49% | 50% | | | | 74% | 52% | 54% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 59% | | | | | | 63% | 52% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 45% | | | | | | 50% | 45% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | 75% | 36% | 36% | | | | 74% | 55% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 68% | | | | | | 63% | 55% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 61% | | | | | | 54% | 50% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 62% | 55% | 53% | | | | 68% | 51% | 51% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 88% | 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 | 75% | 52% | 23% | 54% | 21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 48% | 21% | 52% | 17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | -75% | | | | |
| | 2019 | 74% | 54% | 20% | 56% | 18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| | | -69% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 43% | 10% | 55% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 76% | 49% | 27% | 54% | 22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -53% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 36% | 36% | 0% | 46% | -10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -76% | | | | |

| 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 | 68% | 49% | 19% | 48% | 20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 67% | -67% | 67% | -67% |
| 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 | 91% | 63% | 28% | 61% | 30% |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 88% | 53% | 35% | 57% | 31% |

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 | 28 | 41 | 33 | 38 | 49 | 50 | 30 | 53 | 50 | | |
| ELL | 50 | 53 | 48 | 60 | 62 | 53 | 38 | 78 | 80 | | |
| ASN | 82 | 54 | 50 | 85 | 77 | 69 | 83 | 94 | 94 | | |
| BLK | 48 | 53 | 47 | 56 | 67 | 64 | 34 | 76 | 82 | | |
| HSP | 62 | 54 | 43 | 68 | 66 | 60 | 51 | 83 | 91 | | |
| MUL | 82 | 53 | | 74 | 65 | | | 75 | 92 | | |
| WHT | 76 | 63 | 45 | 81 | 69 | 62 | 70 | 94 | 90 | | |
| FRL | 53 | 51 | 43 | 58 | 57 | 52 | 45 | 74 | 82 | | |

| 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 | 22 | 33 | 27 | 24 | 38 | 36 | 22 | 49 | 53 | | |
| ELL | 50 | 70 | 66 | 53 | 52 | 43 | 34 | 60 | 75 | | |
| ASN | 86 | 71 | | 85 | 45 | 40 | 80 | 89 | 88 | | |
| BLK | 50 | 45 | 34 | 43 | 33 | 37 | 31 | 60 | 68 | | |
| HSP | 65 | 63 | 56 | 60 | 45 | 45 | 52 | 70 | 75 | | |
| MUL | 83 | 58 | | 80 | 58 | | 92 | 80 | 77 | | |
| WHT | 76 | 59 | 41 | 78 | 50 | 55 | 67 | 85 | 85 | | |
| FRL | 54 | 51 | 36 | 49 | 40 | 40 | 46 | 62 | 70 | | |

| 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 | 39 | 29 | 35 | 46 | 36 | 40 | 43 | 83 | | |
| ELL | 56 | 65 | 61 | 56 | 56 | 47 | 52 | 63 | 83 | | |
| ASN | 80 | 67 | 57 | 85 | 70 | 71 | 82 | 95 | 94 | | |
| BLK | 57 | 52 | 34 | 54 | 54 | 43 | 42 | 68 | 77 | | |
| HSP | 68 | 62 | 54 | 70 | 61 | 54 | 64 | 79 | 87 | | |
| MUL | 92 | 65 | | 89 | 76 | | 92 | 100 | 90 | | |
| WHT | 80 | 66 | 56 | 80 | 65 | 55 | 75 | 85 | 90 | | |
| FRL | 61 | 57 | 45 | 58 | 56 | 46 | 51 | 75 | 81 | | |

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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 69 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 76 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 693 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

| | |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 41 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

English Language Learners

| | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 60 |
| 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 | 76 |
| 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 | 59 |
| 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 | 65 |
| 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 | 74 |
| 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 | 72 |
| 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 | 57 |
| 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?

A trend of proficiency gaps exists across grade level and content areas with the following subgroups: SWD, ELL and African American students. These gaps are most evident in ELA and Math. Civics data year after year has shown a decrease in the gaps for the aforementioned subgroups.

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

Our greatest need for improvement is increasing the proficiency of our SWD population.

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

Factors that contribute to this need include the depth of differentiation strategies, limited resources for push in and pull out personnel, and maintaining staff to support SWD (i.e.: staffing specialist and support facilitators). To address this improvement, taking a more focused look at supporting these students with intervention teachers in multiple content areas and increase awareness and implementation of differentiation strategies to improve student engagement and proficiency.

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

Our 7th grade students in Math and ELA showed the highest proficiency ratings when compared to other traditional middle schools. Civics data show a 10% increase in proficiency. Science data reflects a slow and steady increase year after year with a 2% increase in proficiency in the 21-22 school year.

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

Our Civics team had one teacher turn over and added an intervention teacher. There is an increased focus on Math PLC in 7th grade. This one factor has lead to high proficiency rates. Data chats in our ELA classes may have contributed to proficiency growth across grade levels in PLC's.

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

We will continue to embed reviews throughout the year for Science. We will also leverage project based learning across grade levels and content areas to help address the holistic nature of education and remove learning in silos. We will continue the use of district-created educative materials and assessments to analyze and remediate student performance.

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.

B.E.S.T. trainings, project based learning trainings, additional support in ESE, Math, ELA and behavior through the use of intervention teachers
Those teachers will be embedded in the PLC process.

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

We will continue to partner with teachers and after school programs for power hour tutoring assistance. We will partner with Junior Achievement to bring real-world experiences to students. We will use ESSR funds for intervention teachers to support the planning and delivery of content to students.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus

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

Teachers will use common formative assessments, i-Ready and other data to progress monitor student achievement and provide interventions to students with an emphasis on sub-group populations. When educators are provided with time and resources for progress monitoring and intervention development, implementation instructional practices can be adjusted to meet the needs of all students and narrow the achievement gap. Teachers will use common formative assessments, supplemental software programs (i.e. IXL, CAS), and other data to monitor student achievement and provide interventions to students with emphasis on sub-group populations.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increased use of common formative assessment across PLC's in all content areas
Narrowing of achievement gap for students with disabilities through using high yield strategies, progress monitoring and implementation of developed interventions to improve student achievement

Monitoring:

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

Utilize Performance Matters and CAS to monitor the implementation and results from common assessments and to track subgroup student performance through coaching observations, peer coaching feedback and support in instructional strategies that will differentiate learning for subgroups of students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy McHale (amy.mchale@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Focus on High Yield strategies across content areas. Monitor progress monitoring data to ensure interventions are developed and implemented to improve student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for

Define high yield strategies for ESE students for all teachers and provide professional learning and support in the following areas:
 1. Build system of communication of assessment information to stakeholders
 2. Build a system of how we analyze data, instructional practices and make adjustments to improve student outcomes.
 3. Develop and implement systematic approach to scaffolded supports

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

4. Develop and implement the use of flexible grouping
5. Provide intensive instruction.

Unify and Performance Matters will provide analytic data for student performance and quality of teacher assessment. Student monitoring will include student outcomes from formative assessments and supplemental software programs. We will provide professional learning and discourse among classroom teachers and special educators to include an understanding of each assessments purpose and to ensure appropriate accommodations and modifications, fair grading practices and transition goals that are aligned with student needs.

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.

1. Regularly scheduled time for collaboration and progress monitoring between classroom teacher and ESE support staff
2. PLC focus on teacher utilization of Curriculum Resource Materials and other educative resource materials available on IMS.
3. PLC utilizing Unify and Performance Matters progress monitoring resources
4. Increased communication to stakeholders of assessment information and goal development/ implementation process.

Person Responsible

Amy McHale (amy.mchale@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

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

When educators are provided with clear and consist expectations for student learning (i.e.: B.E.S.T. Standards), they can better prepare and plan for progress monitoring and intervention development as well as implementation of instructional practices. Multiple content areas, even if not using B.E.S.T, can support students learning by understanding how the shifts in the standards apply across content areas.

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

Outcomes will be measured by progress monitoring data and teacher feedback and training.

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

Common planning will include multiple leadership team members to be a part of the group setting and guide the process and monitor via PLC's the feedback and look for identified by the leadership team. Student data will be reviewed quarterly to determine student needs and areas of instructional improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Clinton Anderson (clinton.anderson@ocps.net)

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

To implement this area of focus, we will utilize state provided resources and standards crosswalks to make connections from former standards to current standards. This is an initial step in leading teachers to understand the B.E.S.T. standards. With district support, IMPACT teachers have been identified to share best practices and strategies for implementing new standards with educators at our school. Classroom observations amongst PLC's coupled with PLC conversations regarding the implementation of standards will be ongoing.

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 chosen to train educators and prepare them for implementation of B.E.S.T. standards. District-created educative training materials, standards crosswalks provided by state and district

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.

1. Shift from LAFS/MAFS to B.E.S.T. Identify cross curricular supports and connections
2. Implement distributive leadership practices across leadership team to support PLC's to include peer feedback and coaching.
3. Facilitate use of systems (state, district and school based) to promote communication and analysis of data and instructional practices across PLC's

5. Celebration of successes and growth

Person Responsible Clinton Anderson (clinton.anderson@ocps.net)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Sense of Belonging

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.</p> | <p>Integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture to grow every student academically. Build and establish sense of belonging 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 material. By ensuring that our school is culturally inclusive, we will address the following needs: A sense of belonging and culturally responsive instruction to narrow the achievement gap of subgroups Positively influence school culture and teacher practice as it relates to the safety and security of the learning environment for all students</p> |
| <p>Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.</p> | <p>Narrow achievement gap for sub-group populations and impact on student, teacher and parent surveys (Cognia survey data) anticipated impact of a culture and climate on student achievement Early Warning Systems indicator data SESIR data Panorama survey data Student Survey - School Climate, Sense of Belonging Teachers and Staff - School Climate, School Leadership, Professional Learning Family Members - Barriers to Engagement, School Climate Culture & Climate Continuum data</p> |
| <p>Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.</p> | <p>In addition to our annual survey for staff, students and parents, we will provide input opportunities for our stakeholders throughout the year. Culture & Climate Continuum data Classroom Walkthrough trend data Evaluative instructional and leadership practice observational data</p> |
| <p>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</p> | <p>Amy McHale (amy.mchale@ocps.net)</p> |
| <p>Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.</p> | <p>Use distributive leadership and professional learning to implement a continuous improvement plan for a sense of belonging. Description of Monitoring: 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 the Culture and Climate continuum, needs assessments, classroom observations, school environment observations, and implementation surveys. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, staff needs and family needs.</p> |
| <p>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria</p> | <p>In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building, including its families. To strengthen a sense of belonging with families, staff 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 integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective 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</p> |

used for selecting this strategy. practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

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.

Implement a school initiative to promote a sense of belonging
Ensure a school team receives training

Person Responsible Amy McHale (amy.mchale@ocps.net)

Deliberate School Supports for Families

Identify strategies to support family engagement based on Panorama Family Members Survey - Barriers to engagement that relates to strengthening communication, building community and creating connections such as:

Strengthening Communication

Create and facilitate opportunities to welcome families and introduce key staff (back to school night, Open House, principal breakfast)

Develop a school-wide digital communication outreach plan to inform students and families of how they can connect to the school events and resources

Building Community

Establish a family resource center where families can access resources and information to support student and school success

Create a welcoming environment where family culture and languages are recognized and respected (staff greetings, office appeal)

Host events, workshops and opportunities that are relational, connected to family interests and culture, and are linked to learning

Person Responsible Clinton Anderson (clinton.anderson@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.

Deliberate School Supports for Families

Identify strategies to support family engagement based on Panorama Family Members Survey - Barriers to engagement that relates to strengthening communication, building community and creating connections such as:

Strengthening Communication

Create and facilitate opportunities to welcome families and introduce key staff (back to school night, Open House, principal breakfast)

Develop a school-wide digital communication outreach plan to inform students and families of how they can connect to the school events and resources

Building Community

Establish a family resource center where families can access resources and information to support student and school success

Create a welcoming environment where family culture and languages are recognized and respected (staff greetings, office appeal)

Host events, workshops and opportunities that are relational, connected to family interests and culture, and are linked to learning

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

Educators and Administrative personnel - providing opportunities for professional growth and experiences for stakeholders to support a positive school culture

Parents and families play a critical role in our school culture and environment. It is necessary for these stakeholders to provide support and perspective of our school culture.