Gotha Middle

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Gotha Middle

9155 GOTHA RD, Windermere, FL 34786

https://gothams.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Monica Emery

Start Date for this Principal: 2/16/2018

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)	81%
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: B (54%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (53%)
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	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 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

Gotha Middle

9155 GOTHA RD, Windermere, FL 34786

https://gothams.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	81%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership
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
Emery, Monica	Principal	
Coner, Chivas	Assistant Principal	
Hopkins, Christina	Assistant Principal	
Brown, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	
Nealy, Angela		
Hayes, Kimberly	Dean	6th Grade
Taylor, Richard	Dean	7th Grade
Bellamy, Katrina	Dean	8th grade
Soper, Christina	School Counselor	
Woodward, Rachel	School Counselor	
McGinley, Marjorie	ELL Compliance Specialist	
Corcino, Nannette	Staffing Specialist	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 2/16/2018, Monica Emery

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.*
0

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,054

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

7

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

6

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	344	317	350	1	0	0	0	1012
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	77	350	0	0	0	0	495
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	19	13	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	19	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	70	96	0	0	0	0	245
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	77	100	0	0	0	0	268
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	77	70	99	0	0	0	0	246

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	1	4	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/5/2022

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	331	361	397	0	0	0	0	1089
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	68	73	0	0	0	0	191
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	16	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	19	101	0	0	0	0	140
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	25	53	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	54	59	0	0	0	0	151
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	60	67	0	0	0	0	166
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	47	65	98	0	0	0	0	210

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	2	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	8

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	331	361	397	0	0	0	0	1089
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	68	73	0	0	0	0	191
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	16	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	19	101	0	0	0	0	140
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	25	53	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	54	59	0	0	0	0	151
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	60	67	0	0	0	0	166
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	47	65	98	0	0	0	0	210

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	2	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	8

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	54%	49%	50%				53%	52%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	51%						51%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%						35%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	53%	36%	36%				54%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	56%						56%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						41%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	55%	53%				44%	51%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	64%	61%	58%				73%	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	48%	52%	-4%	54%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	51%	48%	3%	52%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
08	2022					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	35%	43%	-8%	55%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	52%	49%	3%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
08	2022					
	2019	45%	36%	9%	46%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

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	43%	49%	-6%	48%	-5%
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	71%	66%	5%	71%	0%

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	82%	63%	19%	61%	21%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	87%	53%	34%	57%	30%

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	23	34	23	22	41	38	29	18			
ELL	37	48	39	36	50	43	30	34	62		
ASN	75	68		72	71		68	100	80		
BLK	39	42	30	35	48	44	34	55	67		
HSP	47	49	43	49	54	47	46	53	74		
MUL	55	44		45	65						
WHT	73	61	24	74	64	48	74	78	81		
FRL	41	46	33	38	52	46	39	50	69		
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	17	34	25	21	32	30	14	40			
ELL	24	40	41	25	32	34	11	43	62		

| 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
ASN	80	61		76	55		88	70	89		
BLK	38	44	35	30	29	26	29	55	57		
HSP	47	51	45	45	36	36	29	61	68		
MUL	52	57		50	33		58				
PAC	40	60		40							
WHT	71	56	35	67	42	34	60	79	89		
FRL	40	47	38	33	30	24	34	50	72		

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	39	31	25	37	26	16	45			
ELL	25	39	37	35	43	37	12	62	58		
ASN	84	81		84	78		76	86	96		
BLK	41	40	29	41	46	38	32	60	82		
HSP	48	49	42	49	53	41	35	73	67		
MUL	41	48		39	40		50	62			
WHT	68	58	36	72	69	48	61	88	89		
FRL	42	45	34	44	49	40	29	64	72		

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	529
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	42
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	44
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	51
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	52
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	64
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	45
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?

From 2019-2021, trends in data show a recovery in achievement in ELA and Math since the COVID19 Pandemic, however, ELA Learning Gains for Low 25 are trending down and Math Learning Gains for Low 25 are trending up between 2019 and 2022. Science Achievement for ESE students has increased by 13 points and Social Studies Achievement has decreased by 27 points between 2019-2022. From 2019-2022, trends in ELL data show an increase in ELA Achievement and Learning Gains 2019-2022 and a recovery of Math Achievement and Math Learning Gains since the COVID-19 Pandemic. Science Achievement has increased by 18 points and Social Studies Achievement has decreased by 28 points between 2019-2022.

From 2019-2022, Black/African American students have remained consistent with ELA Achievement and Learning gains. Math achievement has decreased, however, Learning Gains and Low 25 have increased. Science Achievement is trending up and Social Studies Achievement is trending down. From 2019-2022, Hispanic Students student have remained consistent in ELA and Math Achievement and Learning Gains, however, there is a 6-point increase in Learning Gains for Math Low 25. Science Achievement is trending up and Social Studies Achievement has trended down significantly. From 2019-2022, White students have trended up slightly in ELA Achievement, however, Learning Gains for the Low 25 have dropped by 25 points. Math Achievement and Learning gains have recovered after the COVID-19 Pandemic. Science Achievement has increased by 13 points and Social Studies Achievement has decreased by 10 points.

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

Based on progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, the area with the greatest need for improvement is ELA Learning Gains for Low 25, which dropped 5 points from 2021 to 2022. ELA Achievement and Learning Gains remain stagnant with only an increase of 1 point in ELA Achievement and 0 points in ELA Learning gains from 2021 to 2022. Civics Achievement dropped by 1 point from 2021 to 2022 and Acceleration decreased by 1 from 2021 to 2022.

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

During the 2021-2022 school year, there was a need to improve PLC structures and instructional capacity for new and tier 3 teachers. The actions that have been taken to address the needs include embedding literacy across content areas, the administrator with an ELA background to support PLCs, teacher tiering for coaching and support, and progress monitoring for continued success.

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

Based on progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, the area with the greatest improvement was Math Learning gains with an increase of 20 points from 2021 to 2022. Learning gains for Math Low 25 increased by 16 points and overall Math achievement increased by 5 points from 2021 to 2022. Science Achievement increased by 8 points from 2021 to 2022.

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

During the 2021-2022 school year, Math was supported by our Instructional Coach with expertise in Math, and Science was supported by the AP, a former Science Coach. Actions for improvement include continued support from content experts, embedded literacy across content areas, using data to scaffold and reteach, admin support in PLCs, coaching, and timely feedback.

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

The strategies needed for accelerated learning include identifying students in our Low 25, ESE, ELL, and other subgroups, then using that information to plan for scaffolding and the implementation of literacy across content areas. Using a system of continuous improvement will aid in refining strategies to meet the needs of students. Steps to promote continuous improvement include identifying needs, evaluating and selecting relevant evidence-based interventions, planning for implementation, implementing, examining, and reflecting.

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.

The professional development opportunities that will be provided will be on the BEST standards, scaffolding, using data to inform instruction, engagement, and embedding literacy across content areas during PLCs.

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure the sustainability of improvement are coaching cycles for tier 3 and new teachers to build capacity in classroom instruction. Teachers will be provided opportunities to observe model classrooms, co-teach, plan and collaborate with coaches and seasoned teachers to replicate best practices.

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 Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	The area of focus is learning gains in low 25 in ELA, as well as high achieving students that did not increase or dropped in achievement. This shows a need for increased differentiated instruction for all students.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The outcome will be measured by reviewing FAST data from PM1 to PM2 to if this strategy is working.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Differentiation will be monitored through involvement in PLCs and weekly classroom walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chivas Coner (chivas.coner@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Lesson planning will show scaffolded lessons based on data and student needs. Evidence during instruction will show two to three groups, including a teacher-led group, tracked by the ability to complete scaffolded lessons to meet a common learning target.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The rationale for selecting this strategy is to provide an opportunity for all students to achieve mastery. Resources used for this strategy at district-created CRMs and curriculum.

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

#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.	An area of focus is understanding new standards for ELA and Math. Teachers will be attending IMPACT training related to BEST standards and benchmarks.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The outcome will be measured by reviewing FAST data from PM1 to PM2 to if this strategy is working
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Monitoring of this area of focus will be assuring that teachers attend the training, and admin support in PLCs to ensure alignment of standards and classroom instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rebecca Brown (rebecca.brown4@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Evidence of implementing this area of focus will be instruction aligned to the BEST standard.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The rationale for selecting this strategy is standards for ELA and Math changes and teachers need an opportunity to understand the BEST standard to provide instruction in alignment with district and state expectations. Resources used for this strategy at district-created CRMs and curriculum.

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.

Gotha Middle School addresses building positive school culture and the environment through collaboration between faculty, students, parents, and the community, as well as inclusiveness of the various stakeholders that come from different backgrounds. Keeping inclusiveness, diversity, social-emotional learning and student achievement at the helm of decision-making creates a welcoming environment for all students, parents, and staff. All stakeholders are welcome to provide their perspectives and concerns during decision-making.

Strategies for continued improvement in building a positive school culture and environment includes reflecting on Panorama data and questionnaires, engaging staff on discussions about culture and climate during leadership team meetings and faculty meetings, encourage collaboration with stakeholders to share decision-making on matters that affect culture and climate, and encourage sponsorship of clubs and activities that appeal to the diversity of our student population.

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

Multiple collaborative groups are created to provide input and perspective regarding a sense of belonging and support from the school. That information is used to plan for new initiatives that will support in improving our overall panorama school data. Stakeholders include students, parents, community members, faculty, business partners, and schools within feeder our pattern.