

Orange County Public Schools

Ocoee Middle



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ocoee Middle

300 S BLUFORD AVE, Ocoee, FL 34761

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

Demographics

Principal: Cheri Leavitt

Start Date for this Principal: 6/13/2013

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)	100%
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 Pacific Islander Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ocoee Middle

300 S BLUFORD AVE, Ocoee, FL 34761

<https://ocoeems.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	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	83%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		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
Davis, Samuel	Principal	Samuel Davis- Principal, oversees curriculum and instructions, facilitates the district professional leadership team at the school, implements the school improvement plan, provides administrative professional development, oversees the school budget, supervises the assistant principal, leadership team, performing arts department, foreign language, science department, SAFE department, and the agriculture program.
Frohmborg, Andrew	Assistant Principal	Andrew Frohmborg - Assistant Principal for Instruction, builds the master schedule, monitors CERTIFY and completes the documentation for FTE, supervises registration and attendance, guidance department, math and social studies, physical education department, reviews data and monitores for the i-Ready/trans math program and calculus project.
Grant, Gina	Assistant Principal	Gina Grant- Assistant Principal, oversees all technology, facilities, property, supervised digital electives, fine arts department, discipline, ELA and Reading.
Shaw, Amber	Dean	Amber Shaw- 7th grade dean of students, oversees all discipline for 7th grade students, Title IX contact, monitors the progress of her focus group of students, incentive for teachers and students lead, and supports the language arts, reading, and math departments.
Hulcher, Liana	Staffing Specialist	Reviews ESE Referrals and placement document; works with leadership team to ensure accuracy and completion of documentation; facilitates eligibility and placement meetings and serves as the representative for the development, revision and annual reviews of the Individual Educational Plan (IEP).
Mondesir, Mari		Data analysis and progress monitoring for ELL student population; provide accommodations and modification resources; professional development to support ELL students; ELL documentation, parent/teacher meetings and disaggregation of assessment data.
Ullman , Chloe	Instructional Coach	Chloe Ullman, - Instructional Coach- assists with providing professional development, supports all math at the school, monitors the i-Ready implementation for math, contact for progressbook/parent-student access, and supports math department.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/13/2013, Cheri Leavitt

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.*

1

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

70

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,151

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.

14

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	400	388	401	0	0	0	0	1189
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	120	131	0	0	0	0	333
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	58	41	0	0	0	0	110
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	15	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	9	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	134	129	0	0	0	0	375
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	125	153	0	0	0	0	375
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	92	143	149	0	0	0	0	384

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	6	2	0	0	0	0	8

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/29/2022

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	388	414	459	0	0	0	0	1261
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	388	414	459	0	0	0	0	1261	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	

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	41%	49%	50%				49%	52%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	47%						55%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%						48%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	42%	36%	36%				52%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	56%						58%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						49%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	55%	53%				48%	51%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	63%	61%	58%				70%	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	54%	52%	2%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	45%	48%	-3%	52%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2022					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	51%	43%	8%	55%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	39%	49%	-10%	54%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2022					
	2019	32%	36%	-4%	46%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

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	46%	49%	-3%	48%	-2%
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	69%	66%	3%	71%	-2%
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	83%	63%	20%	61%	22%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	85%	53%	32%	57%	28%

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	9	29	26	5	40	48	11	15			
ELL	21	37	31	24	48	54	28	44	61		
ASN	61	66		70	62		65	70	67		
BLK	38	46	38	37	56	54	52	65	59		
HSP	37	41	31	38	52	48	43	56	62		
MUL	67	64		57	69						
PAC	42	57		44	77						
WHT	51	51	36	52	58	51	54	71	53		
FRL	33	42	35	35	54	51	41	58	52		
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	9	27	24	9	26	26	19	24			

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
ELL	17	27	22	17	21	25	8	36	36		
ASN	65	54		76	48		75	73	78		
BLK	46	46	34	37	26	24	41	63	50		
HSP	41	38	19	38	29	27	35	49	54		
MUL	57	57		64	50						
PAC	50			60							
WHT	47	41	22	48	38	35	45	67	55		
FRL	37	36	22	33	27	29	29	49	52		
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	15	41	39	17	41	41	30	30	80		
ELL	21	46	47	28	45	45	16	47	71		
ASN	76	70		73	71		69	79	85		
BLK	48	52	43	51	58	49	45	75	80		
HSP	38	52	51	43	51	46	36	60	70		
MUL	65	52		59	63		60	60	70		
PAC	45	55		80	60						
WHT	59	59	46	61	64	56	63	79	78		
FRL	44	53	50	46	56	49	41	67	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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	484
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	66
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	49
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	45
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	64
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	55
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	53
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	43
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?

The following trends were identified:

ELA achievement decreased by 4%
 ELA learning gains increased by 4%
 Math achievement remained the same
 Math learning gains increased by 25%
 Science achievement increased 7%
 Civics achievement increased by 9%

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

The data demonstrates that our greatest need for improvement is ELA achievement across all grade levels based on progress monitoring and 2021 achievement levels.

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

Contributing factors include limited understanding of tier 1 standard-aligned instructional practices, and the use of disaggregated data for small group instruction, differentiation and monitoring.

New actions taken will be structured PLC's with admin and instructional coach support, where PLC members have the opportunity to discuss and collaborate on how lessons and activities align to the new BEST standards, and how instructional strategies will be used. Admin and instructional coach will have opportunities to provide actionable feedback at the moment.

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

The data showed that the most improvement from the previous year was Mathematics learning gains at 56%, a 25% increase from 2021, including 52% learning gains in the lowest 25%, and an increase of 24%.

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

Tier 1 instructional practices that focused on standard aligned instruction. Use of disaggregated data to support small group instruction, scaffolding, and differentiation for the lowest 25%

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

Standard aligned instruction based on new BEST standards
Instructional strategies focused on differentiation
Student grouping based on iReady, PM, and common assessment data
Support facilitation provided through reading
Data discussions in PLCs that focus on MTSS and other tier groups
Focus on effective instructional practices
Common planning focused on standard alignment to BEST standards, instructional strategies, data disaggregation, and progress monitoring of subgroups.

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 administrative team and instructional coach will develop professional developments that focus on:
Learning and aligning content to the new BEST standards
Effective data-based instructional strategies
Trend data from classroom walkthroughs
ESE accommodations
Classroom engagement strategies
Articulation based on the most recent FAST progress monitoring data

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

School wide progress monitoring of student learning through common assessments, PMAs and FAST
Create an atmosphere of belong for teachers and students by addressing PANORAMA data
PLC expectations and outcomes will be established and monitored
Classroom walkthrough, coaching observations and instructional rounds will be conducted regularly

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 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.	<p>Area of Focus: Become familiar and implement new BEST standards in tier 1 instruction</p> <p>Use instructional strategies to increase student collaboration and discussion in order to make meaningful connections with the subject material.</p> <p>Rationale: ELA proficiency decreased 4% in spring 22 FSA and 8% from spring 21 FSA ESSA data identified SWD subgroup performing at 41.6% and ELL Subgroup at 7.5% on spring 22 FSA</p>
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	<p>Improvement in Early Warning System Indicator data Increase ELA achievement on FAST PM3 by at least 7% overall. Increase ELA achievement on FAST PM3 by at 5% in SWD subgroup, and 10% in ELL subgroup</p>
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	<p>Administrators and instructional coach will attend all PLC meetings for ELA, Science, Civics and Mathematics teachers to collaborate with teachers and monitor use of standard aligned instruction, data discussions of common assessments, PMA's and PMs, and use of small groups and differentiation to target ESSA subgroups.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Samuel Davis (samuel.davis3@ocps.net)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	<p>Use distributive leadership through PLCs and professional developments to strengthen core instructional team's understanding of BEST standards and collaboration to build academic expertise with all students.</p> <p>The school administrative team and instructional coach will plan and implement professional developments that will focus on standard deconstruction, standard alignment on planned lessons and activities, practice with designing and feedback on sample lessons, and data based instructional strategies. The school will monitor and measure the impact of our professional developments through the analysis of classroom walkthroughs, school culture and climate surveys, needs assessments, and data from common assessments, FAST PMs and PMA's. The team will analyze data collected and collaborate to make modifications based on student and teacher needs.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based	<p>To achieve long term improvement, it is necessary to invest in the school as a whole. To create a culture academic success with students, teachers, and leadership, it is critical to harness the professional skills of everyone at the school. To create a culture of</p>

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

academic success with adults and students, we will use distributive leadership to strengthen the dynamics of our teacher, classified, and leadership teams in order to collectively support the improvement of our school.

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.

Teachers will meet as PLCs by content and grade levels to discuss standard aligned instruction, data from common assessments, PMA's and FAST PMs.

Person Responsible Samuel Davis (samuel.davis3@ocps.net)

PLCs will establish norms and expectations to guide agendas and areas of responsibilities for each team member.

Person Responsible Samuel Davis (samuel.davis3@ocps.net)

PLCs will collaborate to plan for what instructional strategies will be used in instruction to engage students in content, provide processing time for students, and monitor student understanding.

Person Responsible Andrew Frohmborg (andrew.frohmborg@ocps.net)

Core instructional teams (math, science, language arts and civics) will discuss most recent and trending data from common assessments, PMA's and FAST PMs to guide instruction.

Person Responsible Andrew Frohmborg (andrew.frohmborg@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

The English Language Learners (ELL) subgroup has one of the most significant achievement gaps among Ocoee Middle School students. To increase proficiency to narrow the achievement gap and target professional learning around the implementation of best practices for inclusive education will be a focus for the 2022-2023 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase proficiency levels of the ELL subgroup of 10% in order to decrease the achievement gaps for ELL subgroup by as measured by state assessments in English language arts, math, science and civics during the 2022-23 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators and resource personnel will regularly review student performance data to look for evidence of an increase in student achievement using data from common assessments and grade reports. In addition, administrators and resource personnel will regularly meet to discuss the targeted students to determine any adjustments needed in our support program and push in model.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mari Mondesir (mari.mondesir@ocps.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Professional development for teachers to learn and practice ELL strategies in lessons.
Ongoing professional development on BEST standards
Coaching and mentoring new teachers

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The leadership team has decided to use these strategies to ensure that ELL students are provided opportunities to interact with the content in ways that remove the language barrier. The leadership team will closely monitor ELL student learning to ensure they are able to achieve proficiency on the FAST reading and math assessments.

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.

Classroom visits to monitor instructional strategies and ELL strategies.

Person Responsible

Andrew Frohberg (andrew.frohberg@ocps.net)

Monitor instructional strategies and practices and student performance based on language learning level.

Person Responsible

Mari Mondesir (mari.mondesir@ocps.net)

#3. 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.

The students with disabilities (SWD) subgroup has one of the most significant achievement gaps among Ocoee Middle School students. To increase proficiency to narrow the achievement gap and target professional learning around the implementation of best practices for inclusive education will be a focus for the 2021-2022 school year.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

We expect to increase proficiency for these students in ELA by 15%, Math by 10%, Science by 5%, and Social Studies by 20%. Ensuring that we are focusing on the students in this subgroup and achieving the goals set, the increase in percentages will exceed 41% on the ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index.

Monitoring:

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

To monitor our focus there will be increased scaffolding measures for inclusion, effective implementation of the gradual release model, differentiated small groups, and equipping students with the necessary strategies to work independently without prompting as monitored by the classroom teachers, administrators and compliance coordinator.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gina Grant (gina.grant@ocps.net)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

The gradual release model is a research-based best practice instructional model. Teachers strategically transfer the responsibility in the learning process to the students. There are four phases: "I do," where the teacher models the lesson objective, "we do," guided instruction with both input from the teacher and the students, "you do," independent practice.

Rationale for Evidence-

As the student acquires the new information and skills, the responsibility of learning shifts from teacher-directed instruction to student processing activities, with students relying

based

Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

more on themselves and less on the teacher. Small group instruction provides an environment in which students can feel comfortable practicing and receiving feedback and teachers can offer additional teaching and modeling of content. It is important to know students' instructional levels to effectively plan and implement small group instruction. Teachers using various monitoring techniques such as formative assessments, check-ins and student samples, are able to make adaptations for students who are struggling.

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.

Classroom visits to monitor instructional practices and ESE strategies.

Person

Responsible

Gina Grant (gina.grant@ocps.net)

Monitor instructional practices and student performance in learning strategies and support facilitation.

Person

Responsible

Liana Hulcher (liana.hulcher@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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, our school will engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, we will use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, we will use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language as additional support. A core team of teachers and administrators, which includes our SAFE coordinator and school psychologist, will attend district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the

Parent Academy, Multicultural Night, Performance Arts presentations and academic reward events/student recognition activities. To ensure that we have an inclusive environment and all families and students are receiving support and resources, The SEL Site Team and existing PLC structure will generate and implement multiple teacher focused positive initiatives. The cookie exchange, Quote of the day, Vibes (ZEN Room) for teachers will be implemented and monitored by the SEL site team throughout the year. Parent Engagement Liaisons will be used to bridge the community and school culture. All programs and initiatives will be monitored by core leaders and reported on at leadership weekly meetings.

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

Principal (Samuel Davis)– Facilitate District SEL Initiative, SEL Site Team, Panorama Surveys, Climate and Culture Surveys and associated Professional Development

Assistant Principal (Andrew Frohmborg) - Model through leadership and transparent vision: Participate in all SEL initiatives and active facilitators

SEL Site Team (Reed, Song, D. Hinkle, C. Ramirez)- Practice Distributive Leadership in disseminating SEL Initiatives to faculty, conduct SEL Site Team Walks

SAFE Coordinator (Denise Reed) – Referral and Staging of Morning VIBES, Teacher ZEN Room and Faculty Self Care Training

Incentives Team (Amber Shaw, Liana Hulcher, Mari Mondesir)- Develop and Implement incentives focused on Teacher/ Student Climate and Culture (Grab and Go Breakfast, Coffee Cart, Cookie Exchange, Holiday Part, Field Days, 8th Grade Social, Fall Pot Luck, ETC)

Wallace Phillips- Grant Funded SEL Coordinator- Coordinates with SEL Site team to implement initiatives with student involvement