

Orange County Public Schools

# Chain Of Lakes Middle



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

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

# Chain Of Lakes Middle

8700 CONROY WINDERMERE RD, Orlando, FL 32835

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Robert Walker**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/29/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (45%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (50%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

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

# Chain Of Lakes Middle

8700 CONROY WINDERMERE RD, Orlando, FL 32835

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

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	89%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	84%

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>
<b>Grade</b>	C	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.**

Our Mission: With the support of families and the community, create enriching and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

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

Our Vision: 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
Walker, Robert	Principal	Oversee all school operations. Directly supervise ELA department, Electives, and assistant principals.
McConnell, Gabriela	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Instruction. Oversees scheduling, FTE compliance, school counselors, instructional coach, science department, math department, and partners directly with corrective programs to strengthen instruction across the campus. Partners with other assistant principal to co-chair curriculum and instruction team.
Correa, Allison	ELL Compliance Specialist	Tracks and monitors data related to the performance of our English language learners (ELL). Provides coaching to teachers for best practices in supporting ELL students. Partners with instructional coach to provide professional development to support teachers in instructing our ELL population. Serves on curriculum and instruction team which is tasked with providing instructional support to our teachers.
Coleman, Altresse	Instructional Coach	Provides support to all new teachers. Provides coaching and support to teachers as identified by curriculum and instruction team. Serves on curriculum and instruction team. Oversees implementation of PD across the campus and supports professional growth through deliberate practice planning.
Wyatt, Tameka	Staffing Specialist	Oversees ESE compliance. Partners with ESE teachers to ensure services outlined on IEPs are provided. Provides training to teachers so that they are informed about how to provide accommodations and necessary documentation.
Brown, James	Dean	Works as part of behavior modification office. Employs restorative practices to cultivate relationships with students. Works to teach students appropriate ways to resolve conflict. Assigns consequences to students for violations of the code of student conduct.
Gregory, Grace	Dean	Works as part of behavior modification office. Employs restorative practices to cultivate relationships with students. Works to teach students appropriate ways to resolve conflict. Assigns consequences to students for violations of the code of student conduct.
Harbin, Charles	Assistant Principal	Mr. Harbin oversees our behavior modification team. He will use an emphasis on relationship building and restorative practices to lead the modification of student behavior to cultivate a safe and positive learning environment. Mr. Harbin will also oversee both our reading and social studies department. He will also be our administrator over facilities, working with our custodial team as well as our partners who rent space on our campus



**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 6/29/2022, Robert Walker

**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.*

29

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

56

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

1,197

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

26

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

20

**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	420	340	376	0	0	0	0	1136
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	129	149	0	0	0	0	392
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	69	84	0	0	0	0	172
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	15	6	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	3	19	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	138	163	0	0	0	0	446
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	174	131	158	0	0	0	0	463
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	138	163	0	0	0	0	446

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	147	152	186	0	0	0	0	485

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

Thursday 9/8/2022

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	392	395	357	0	0	0	0	1144
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	158	113	0	0	0	0	344
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	35	48	0	0	0	0	86
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	38	100	0	0	0	0	178
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	52	69	0	0	0	0	142
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	92	94	0	0	0	0	270
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	99	95	0	0	0	0	264
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	81	129	145	0	0	0	0	355

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	1	9	1	0	0	0	0	11

**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	392	395	357	0	0	0	0	1144
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	158	113	0	0	0	0	344
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	35	48	0	0	0	0	86
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	38	100	0	0	0	0	178
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	52	69	0	0	0	0	142
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	92	94	0	0	0	0	270
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	99	95	0	0	0	0	264
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	81	129	145	0	0	0	0	355

**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	1	9	1	0	0	0	0	11

**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	37%	49%	50%				50%	52%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	44%						54%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%						53%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	42%	36%	36%				48%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	47%						51%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						52%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	55%	53%				48%	51%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	54%	61%	58%				56%	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.**

<b>ELA</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2022					
	2019	49%	52%	-3%	54%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	36%	48%	-12%	52%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
08	2022					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2022					
	2019	47%	43%	4%	55%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	40%	49%	-9%	54%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
08	2022					
	2019	15%	36%	-21%	46%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	41%	49%	-8%	48%	-7%
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	51%	66%	-15%	71%	-20%
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	81%	63%	18%	61%	20%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	95%	53%	42%	57%	38%

**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	11	34	32	17	34	33	4	30			
ELL	25	41	33	30	40	36	22	41	58		
ASN	71	47		83	63			73	70		
BLK	30	43	33	31	42	39	31	49	65		
HSP	39	44	34	43	49	43	38	54	66		
MUL	54	48		63	52			54			
PAC	18			40							
WHT	46	46	23	57	49	43	67	68	74		
FRL	31	40	33	32	42	37	31	46	64		
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	8	26	34	17	27	23	18	11			

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	20	48	54	29	37	35	17	20	42		
ASN	81	80		85	46		60		69		
BLK	31	35	33	27	27	28	22	32	44		
HSP	38	45	52	44	37	34	38	41	59		
MUL	68	48		54	40						
WHT	57	51	45	66	46	38	57	68	82		
FRL	35	38	36	33	28	27	29	33	57		

  

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	20	47	40	18	44	47	16	39			
ELL	36	56	54	42	57	53	31	41	80		
ASN	78	63		78	56		70	75	88		
BLK	37	48	50	34	42	44	35	45	63		
HSP	51	59	53	51	57	55	46	55	78		
MUL	63	48		76	59			79			
WHT	67	60	70	66	56	70	70	78	81		
FRL	45	53	50	43	48	50	42	53	74		

**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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%

  

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
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	68
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	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	54
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	29
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

School-wide data showed improvement in all school grade components, except for reading achievement and reading learning gains for students in the bottom quartile. Overall reading achievement declined 3% from year prior and bottom quartile gains declined 10% from year prior. Within our subgroups SWD, ELL, and Hispanic students all made modest gains in reading achievement from year prior (3 points for SWD, 5 for ELL, and 1 for HSP). Asian, White, and Multiracial students all showed double-digit declines in reading from year prior. Black students declined by one point. Math achievement showed modest gains, 1 and 4 points respectively, for ELL and black students. White and multiracial student achievement declined by 9 points, meanwhile Asian and Hispanic students saw small declines of 2 and 1 point. School-wide math achievement was the same as year prior, 42%. Learning gains in math improved by 13% and learning gains for the bottom quartile grew by 10%.

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

Reading achievement was not only the area in which 2022 data showed decline from year prior, it is also the school's lowest area of achievement, at 37%. This is 3% lower than our next lowest area, science. Science represents only 8th grade, while the low performance in reading represents the entire school. Based on this, reading represents the greatest area of need.

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

Learning loss caused by the disruption to schooling due to the COVID-19 pandemic coupled with a staffing shortage that resulted in a high-level of use of substitute teachers in core content classes are both contributing factors to this low performance. An increased focus on providing support to close the learning loss gaps, as well as working to off-set the impact of the staffing shortage through the use of supplemental materials will address this need.

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

The greatest area of improvement would be in Civics. From 2021 to 2022, Civics improved by 12% going from 42% to 54%.

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



Changes in the Civics department coupled with an emphasis on standards-based instruction in the PLC were contributing factors. Due to several resignations within the department, our school has an entirely new civics PLC for 2022-23. In order to support this new team, and build upon our prior growth in this area, we will be partnering with Civics program specialist to provide comprehensive support to the new teachers on this team.

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

In order to accelerate learning, we will be implementing four non-negotiable areas of instructional focus for this year. These are bell-to-bell instruction, spending time in thought everyday, building community & relationships, and using academic vocabulary. Bell-to-bell instruction ensures we're maximizing our use of the instructional minutes available to us. Spending time in thought everyday ensures we're cognitively engaging students daily, learning cannot be accelerated if we are not ensuring cognitive engagement. Building community and relationships is informed by John Hattie's work that showed the power of strong student-teacher relationships to impact learning and on Dr. Carol Dweck's work with mindset as a strong classroom community lends itself to a space where students feel okay about making mistakes. Finally, the intentional focus on academic vocabulary ensures we are familiarizing students with the formal language they are likely to encounter as they continue their educational journey and that they are likely to see on exams.

**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.**

We will work to provide our teachers multiple opportunities for professional development this year. A focus in those will be with engagement. We already provided a mini-PD on engagement during pre-planning. We will also provide PD dealing with restorative practices as both a community building and processing tool. Finally, we will provide PD to assist our teachers with procedures and classroom management, as class disruptions impact the learning of all students.

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

We will build a partnership with the district's Minority Achievement Office (MAO) to provide growth in the areas of restorative practices as well as establishing a mentoring program that will serve a large number of our students. In addition to our work with MAO, we will also partner with district mental health services to provide instruction on conflict resolution to our students to provide students school-appropriate means of resolving their conflicts. We will also work to build our PBIS program to ensure we are not simply providing consequences for behavior that violates the code of conduct, but also provide incentives for behavior that meets and exceeds expectations. We will also be partnering with the district's corrective programs team to provide direct support in core academic areas through program specialists who will be engaging with teachers and PLCs along with our school-based leadership team.

**Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** Improving reading achievement school-wide. When reviewing data trends, reading is the only area in which overall achievement declined from year prior. Given that reading was 40% in 2020-21, the decline to 37% establishes an even greater need for focused improvement in this area.  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

**Measurable Outcome:** The measurable outcome will be improving school-wide reading achievement by 10 points, from 37% to 47%.  
**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

**Monitoring:** Progress in this area of focus will be monitored using a combination of iReady diagnostic data, FAST assessment data, and common assessment data from reading and ELA classes.  
**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Robert Walker (robert.walker5@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** To support this area of focus we will use multiple strategies. We will employ focused support through ELA & reading professional learning communities, hold regular data chats with these departments, provide support for instruction through partnership with district program specialists in these areas, and engage level 1 readers in targeted support through our reading classes. These reading classes will employ a rational instructional model to support student acquisition of skills and closing of gaps.  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** These strategies were selected by examining available resources, needs, and high-yield strategies. Supporting both instruction through PLCs as well as data chats will guide those teachers in both their use of high-yield instructional strategies as well as ensuring their work is grounded in student performance data.  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

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

Assistant Principal, Mr. Harbin, will meet weekly with reading department PLC. Principal, Dr. Walker, will provide support to ELA PLCs. Mr. Harbin will partner with Mrs. Malatesta from the learning community office who will be providing direct support to reading teachers. Dr. Walker will partner with ELA program specialist, Mrs. Nicolas, to provide support to ELA department.

**Person Responsible** Charles Harbin (charles.harbin@ocps.net)

Mr. Harbin & Dr. Walker will engage their departments in data chats to include both overall data trends as well as subgroup trends.

**Person Responsible** Charles Harbin (charles.harbin@ocps.net)

Dr. Walker & Mr. Harbin will conduct instructional observations. In conjunction with our curriculum and instruction team, they will identify teachers in those departments in need of additional coaching and support.

**Person Responsible** Robert Walker (robert.walker5@ocps.net)

Instructional Coach, Mrs. Coleman-Moore, will provide coaching and support to teachers in these departments as identified by Mr. Harbin, Dr. Walker, and curriculum and instruction team.

**Person Responsible** Altresse Coleman (altresse.coleman@ocps.net)

**#2. 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.**

2022 subgroup data shows SWD students at Chain of Lakes performing drastically below their peers. SWD students had the lowest achievement in all school grade component areas, including 4% proficiency in science.

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

The target outcome here is to improve SWD performance by 7 points in all areas. This would be an improvement from 11% to 18% in reading, from 17% to 24% in math, 4% to 11% in science, and 30% to 37% in social studies (Civics).

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

Progress toward the above identified goals will be monitored using triangulation of iReady diagnostic, FAST progress monitoring, and common assessment data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Gabriela McConnell (103895@ocps.net)

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

Use distributive leadership to implement a continuous improvement plan of support for our students with disabilities, intentionally integrating best practices in instructional strategies and focusing on collaborative planning and problem solving to identify needs and supports.

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

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. 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 practices that will support the academic development of all students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

The administration team uses data and input from teachers, counselors and the staffing specialist to create a master schedule that supports equity and meets needs of all students.

**Person Responsible** Gabriela McConnell (103895@ocps.net)

Compile data tracking sheets for all SWD to support progress monitoring (admins, counselors, and support facilitation teachers review after each data point to discuss additional supports and interventions).

**Person Responsible** Gabriela McConnell (103895@ocps.net)

Ongoing support of ELA and reading for alignment of instruction and assessment - and ongoing support for intentional planning to increase effectiveness of support facilitation (Quarterly Planning day w/ collaboration between ELA and Support Facilitation).

**Person Responsible** Charles Harbin (charles.harbin@ocps.net)

Curriculum and Instruction team engage in regular walkthroughs to identify strengths, trends and growth opportunities for best practices in instruction. Regularly monitor achievement data. Meet weekly to engage in continuous improvement cycle.

**Person Responsible** Robert Walker (robert.walker5@ocps.net)

**#3. 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.**

ELL students constitute a sizable portion of the school's enrollment, 20%, and their performance has fallen below 40% achievement in all measured areas, and well below their peers, for multiple years. For 2021-22, ELL students had reading achievement of 25%, 12% below the school average, Math achievement also 12% below the school average (30% compared to 42%). ELL science achievement was 22%, 18 points below the school average of 40%. ELL Civics achievement was above the 40% threshold, 41%, but was 13% below the school average, 54%.

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

The goal is to improve ELL performance in all areas by 8 or more points. This would increase reading achievement from 25% to 33%, math achievement from 30% to 38%, science achievement from 22% to 30%, and social studies, Civics, achievement from 41% to 49%.

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

A triangulation of iReady diagnostic, FAST progress monitoring, and common assessment data will be used to monitor our progress toward this goal.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Gabriela McConnell (103895@ocps.net)

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

Use distributive leadership to implement a continuous improvement plan of support for our English language learners, intentionally integrating best practices in instructional strategies and focusing on collaborative planning and problem solving to identify needs and supports.

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

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. 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 practices that will support the academic development of all students.

**selecting this strategy.**

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

ELL Compliance Specialist, Mrs. Correa, will provide teachers with both information identifying ELL students as well as professional development focused on providing instruction to ELL students.

**Person Responsible** Allison Correa (58875@ocps.net)

Compile data tracking sheets for all ELL to support progress monitoring (admins, counselors, and ELL compliance review after each data point to discuss additional supports and interventions).

**Person Responsible** Gabriela McConnell (103895@ocps.net)

Ongoing monitoring of ELL progress data by MTSS team. Tier 1 adjustments made as necessary through data monitoring and MTSS process.

**Person Responsible** Robert Walker (robert.walker5@ocps.net)

Curriculum and Instruction team engage in regular walkthroughs to identify strengths, trends and growth opportunities for best practices in instruction. Regularly monitor achievement data. Meet weekly to engage in continuous improvement cycle.

**Person Responsible** Charles Harbin (charles.harbin@ocps.net)

**#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to School Climate & Student Sense of Belonging**

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

2022 Panorama survey data showed Chain of Lakes students rated the school climate as only 32% favorable, a 15% decline from year prior, and below district middle school, learning community, and board district averages. The survey data also showed students rating their sense of belonging at Chain of Lakes at only 34% positive. This was a 5% decline from year prior and also below all the above listed averages.

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

The goal is to improve student rating of school climate by 5 points, from 32% to 37%, and to increase student sense of belonging by 5 points as well, from 34% to 39%.

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

Anecdotal data will be collected through both formal and informal roundtable meetings between leadership team members and students. Student feedback will also be collected through surveys, including the 2023 Panorama survey.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Robert Walker (robert.walker5@ocps.net)

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

An emphasis on building relationships and community in classrooms, one of our four non-negotiables, coupled with a focus on Restorative Practices will be employed to achieve the desired outcomes. PBIS, Osprey Bucks, will also be incorporated here.

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

Research has shown consistent use of restorative practices positively impacts school climate. Additionally, the focus on building community in classrooms will serve to increase the feeling of belonging students experience across the school day.

**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.

Assistant Principal Harbin will integrate restorative practices into our school-wide approach to behavior modification.

**Person Responsible** Charles Harbin (charles.harbin@ocps.net)



Professional development on the use of restorative practices will be provided to faculty and staff through partnership with MAO.

**Person Responsible** Charles Harbin (charles.harbin@ocps.net)

Develop a system for consistent use of Osprey Bucks to incentivize behavior that contributes to positive school climate.

**Person Responsible** Grace Gregory (grace.gregory@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.**

The school addresses building a positive culture and environment through a number of means. Restorative practices, PBIS program (Osprey Bucks), Outstanding Osprey Awards, incentives for grades and attendance, and impromptu positive recognition will all be used to build a positive school culture and environment. Additionally, one of our non-negotiables for instruction this year is a focus on building relationships and community in classrooms which contribute to a positive culture and environment.

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

Principal Walker, Assistant Principals Harbin & McConnell, Deans Gregory & Brown, Instructional Coach Coleman-Moore, and ELL Compliance specialist Correa will all work together to own building and promoting a positive culture and environment at Chain of Lakes. Specifically the deans and Mr. Harbin will be our leaders in bringing a restorative practices based approach to modifying student behavior to Chain of Lakes. Dr. Walker will work to build partnerships to keep the Osprey Store well-stocked to build value into our PBIS program. Mrs. McConnell, Mrs. Correa, and Mrs. Coleman-Moore will work to ensure the store runs as scheduled. The entire team will also partner with PTSA to hold a variety of events to extend the positive culture and environment building efforts to include our families and the community.