

Orange County Public Schools

Union Park Middle



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Union Park Middle

1844 WESTFALL DR, Orlando, FL 32817

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

Demographics

Principal: Isolda Antonio Fisher

Start Date for this Principal: 8/23/2022

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 | Yes |
| 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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: C (47%) 2018-19: D (39%) 2017-18: C (46%) |
| 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 was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Union Park Middle

1844 WESTFALL DR, Orlando, FL 32817

<https://unionparkms.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 | Yes | 100% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 91% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Fisher, Isolda | Principal | The principal provides a common vision and direction for Union Park Middle School, placing student success at the forefront. Teacher evaluations and progress monitoring are used to inform the decision-making process. Data-based decision making is important as the principal oversees curriculum and instruction, ensures the School Improvement Plan is implemented throughout the school year, and that curriculum and instruction are aligned to grade-level specifications. These decisions are discussed and evaluated by the school-based leadership team and communicated to the stakeholders. |
| Burley, Chris | Assistant Principal | The Assistant Principal works with staff to identify appropriate research-based instructional strategies and analyze academic and behavioral data while providing actionable feedback to teachers through observations. The Assistant Principal oversees operations and facilities, deans, electives, and the social studies department. |
| Kendall, Danielle | Assistant Principal | The Assistant Principal works with staff to identify appropriate research-based instructional strategies and analyze academic and behavioral data while providing actionable feedback to teachers through observations. The Assistant Principal oversees the ESOL, Reading, and ELA departments, as well as MTSS. The Assistant Principal organizes instructional coaches. The Assistant Principal of Instruction, works with staff to identify appropriate research-based instructional strategies and analyze academic and behavioral data while providing actionable feedback to teachers through observations. |
| Barcelo, Sonia | School Counselor | The guidance counselor collaborates on school-wide initiatives to increase student achievement. The counselor provides behavioral support and focuses on school-wide PBS to create a culture of respect and positive behavior. Through implementing PBS school-wide, students will increase instructional time in the classroom. The guidance counselors also work closely with the teachers through the Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS). The instructional coaches, guidance counselors, and classroom teachers work together to determine appropriate interventions for students. The guidance counselor monitors students' academic progress, schedules students' classes, and organizes parent-teacher conferences. |
| Richardson, Dennis | Dean | The dean collaborates on school-wide initiatives to increase student achievement. The dean provides behavioral support and focuses on school-wide PBS to create a culture of respect and positive behavior. Through implementing PBS school-wide, students will know expectations which will increase instructional time in the classroom. The dean also works closely with the teachers through the Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) to determine appropriate interventions for students. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Yowler, Angela | Instructional Coach | The instructional coach provides content area support across grade levels. The instructional coach works with the departments as they plan and deliver standards-based instruction focusing on meeting the full intent of the standards. As part of the instructional support team, the coach models lessons and plans with teams to ensure the implementation of high yield strategies within instruction. As part of the MTSS process, the coach assists teachers and the team with appropriate interventions. The instructional coach supports the mathematics department and supports new teachers. |
| Peterson, Cindy | Curriculum Resource Teacher | The curriculum resource teacher provides teachers with the necessary curriculum and instructional materials for the school. The coach is also the testing coordinator. As the testing coordinator, the teacher organizes and prepares the school and teachers for testing. The testing coordinator provides professional development as it relates to testing, and pulling data to guide instruction. |
| Bocourt Gonzalez, Ana | ELL Compliance Specialist | ESOL Compliance: The instructional support person is responsible for supporting English Language Learners at the school. The support person helps ELL students through testing, making sure they are provided appropriate accommodations, the necessary resources for success, and support as needed in the classrooms. The ESOL Compliance Specialist monitors ELL student performance throughout the school year and oversees ESOL Compliance concerns. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/23/2022, Isolda Antonio Fisher

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.*

4

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.*

22

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

706

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

27

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

25

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 106 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 291 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 50 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 73 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 264 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 112 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 286 |
| 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 | 90 | 113 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 309 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/26/2022

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 | 292 | 254 | 269 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 815 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 54 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 31 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 34 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 99 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 168 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 72 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 233 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 95 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 250 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 72 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 233 |

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 | 87 | 112 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 290 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 | 292 | 254 | 269 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 815 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 54 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 31 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 34 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 99 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 168 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 72 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 233 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 95 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 250 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 72 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 233 |

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 | 87 | 112 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 290 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 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 | 31% | 49% | 50% | | | | 30% | 52% | 54% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 40% | | | | | | 36% | 52% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 33% | | | | | | 34% | 45% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | 36% | 36% | 36% | | | | 32% | 55% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 57% | | | | | | 37% | 55% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 69% | | | | | | 44% | 50% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 28% | 55% | 53% | | | | 28% | 51% | 51% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 54% | 61% | 58% | | | | 43% | 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 | 28% | 52% | -24% | 54% | -26% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 22% | 48% | -26% | 52% | -30% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -28% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 33% | 54% | -21% | 56% | -23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -22% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 34% | 43% | -9% | 55% | -21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 17% | 49% | -32% | 54% | -37% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -34% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 11% | 36% | -25% | 46% | -35% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -17% | | | | |

| 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 | 27% | 49% | -22% | 48% | -21% |
| 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 | 40% | 66% | -26% | 71% | -31% |
| 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 | 75% | 63% | 12% | 61% | 14% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 67% | 53% | 14% | 57% | 10% |

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 | 30 | 21 | 14 | 50 | 61 | 7 | 31 | | | |
| ELL | 22 | 42 | 39 | 30 | 63 | 74 | 18 | 40 | 71 | | |
| ASN | 32 | 38 | | 50 | 71 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 40 | 32 | 26 | 45 | 67 | 19 | 53 | | | |
| HSP | 31 | 42 | 34 | 36 | 57 | 72 | 27 | 50 | 77 | | |
| MUL | | | | 67 | 60 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 24 | 28 | | 49 | 65 | 67 | 36 | 71 | 80 | | |
| FRL | 28 | 40 | 34 | 29 | 53 | 65 | 26 | 50 | 76 | | |
| 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 | 21 | 26 | 8 | 17 | 22 | 10 | 9 | | | |
| ELL | 13 | 24 | 25 | 12 | 18 | 25 | 22 | 25 | 40 | | |
| ASN | 47 | 31 | | 71 | 50 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 28 | 35 | 35 | 25 | 19 | 18 | 35 | 36 | 77 | | |
| HSP | 25 | 30 | 27 | 25 | 27 | 28 | 32 | 36 | 56 | | |
| WHT | 33 | 42 | 47 | 37 | 41 | 47 | 64 | 48 | 64 | | |
| FRL | 23 | 28 | 25 | 24 | 28 | 30 | 36 | 34 | 61 | | |
| 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 | 6 | 24 | 24 | 4 | 35 | 40 | 7 | 15 | | | |
| ELL | 18 | 30 | 32 | 18 | 34 | 49 | 14 | 23 | 59 | | |
| ASN | 63 | 48 | | 67 | 52 | | 58 | | 93 | | |
| BLK | 27 | 35 | 44 | 26 | 37 | 38 | 6 | 46 | 57 | | |
| HSP | 28 | 35 | 34 | 30 | 36 | 47 | 24 | 38 | 67 | | |
| WHT | 36 | 35 | 18 | 34 | 39 | 35 | 39 | 47 | 71 | | |
| FRL | 29 | 36 | 37 | 30 | 37 | 46 | 25 | 41 | 67 | | |

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 | 45 |
| 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 | 25 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 452 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 28 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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 | 39 |
| 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 | 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 | |
| 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 | 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 data trend that showed an increase in ELA and Math achievement and learning gains when comparing FSA results for the last four years. The lowest performance, on the 2021-22 FSA was 8th grade Science and learning gains for the lowest 25% in ELA. During the 2021-22 school year, contributing factors included the loss of one science teacher during the school year, and the difficulty finding a replacement teacher. Historical data from FSA (2018-2022) showed that the learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA have shown minimal growth.

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance, on both the 2021-22 FSA and on the 2021-22 progress monitoring assessments (iReady), was learning gains for the lowest 25% in ELA and 8th grade science.

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

The new actions that will take place to address this is all Intensive Reading teachers will have an interventionist working with their class. The interventionist will provide small group instruction by pushing into the class or pulling students to another classroom. Small group instruction will also be implemented in the ELA classes, while focusing on monitoring, processing and engagement. The 8th grade Science teachers will be supported by district program specialist weekly to ensure rigorous standards based instruction.

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

The data components from progress monitoring and the 2022 state assessment that showed the most improvement was learning gains in the lowest 25 percent in mathematics. From the 2018, the scores increased by 26 points. The scores improved by 41 points from the 2021 test scores. Civics proficiency reached the highest level of proficiency in 2022 at 54%, which is an increase of 16 points from the 2021 school year.

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

The factors that contributed to this improvement were support from administrators, school coaches and district program specialists in planning. This ensured standards aligned instruction, and that student processing and engagement strategies were taking place. In addition, teachers were able to stay on pace with the district instructional focus calendar to ensure all standards were taught prior to being assessed. A Civics intervention teacher was utilized to support civics instruction.

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

The strategies that will be implemented to help accelerate student learning are focusing on small group instruction in core subject classes. This will allow teachers to differentiate instruction for acceleration.

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.

Teachers will attend training on the new B.E.S.T. standards, small group instruction, and increasing student engagement throughout the year. This will give them the opportunities to plan for standards aligned instruction, higher level questioning, engagement and processing.

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

The admin and leadership team will work with teachers of all content areas to increase their capacity related to student engagement and standards-based learning tasks. Further, leadership will work with all content area teachers to ensure that opportunities for academic discourse are thoroughly planned and implemented with fidelity.

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

In the 2022-23 school year, UPMS was allotted 3 interventionist positions for intensive reading to be utilized as additional support within those classroom. This will promote effective differentiation within the classroom through small group instruction and/or rotations.

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

The goal for the 2022-23 school year is to increase proficiency in ELA from 31% to 50%, and Mathematics from 36% to 50%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through weekly classroom visits, corrective program analysis, and collected common formative and summative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Isolda Fisher (isolda.antoniofisher@ocps.net)

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

In order to increase the percentage of all students who make proficiency, specifically students within the six federal subgroups (white, black, Hispanic, SWD, ELLs, and economically disadvantaged) who fell below the 41% proficiency threshold, our school will be focusing on small-group differentiated instruction to meet the needs of our students.

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

In reviewing the 2021-22 ESSA data, six federal subgroups (white-39%, black-35%, Hispanic-37%, SWD-19%, ELLs-31%, and economically disadvantaged-39%) fell below the 41% proficiency threshold and nearly 45% of our students scored a level 1 on the FSA in ELA and mathematics. In order to appropriately scaffold the material to help all students improve, small groups are essential. Small groups and differentiating the resources, supports, and scaffolds based on the needs of the students will accelerate student learning.

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.

Leadership will analyze and disaggregate multiple data, such as Progress Monitoring Activities (PMAs), iReady, common assessments, F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring assessments, and other relevant and available program data, in order to establish baseline student academic needs for teachers. (August)

Person Responsible Danielle Kendall (danielle.kendall@ocps.net)

Leadership will train teachers in small group differentiation models and set up a system by which teachers can observe and be coached in the use of the models. This will improve the specificity of the instruction received by all students, including the identified ESSA subgroups (White, Black, Hispanic, SWD, ELLs, and Economically Disadvantaged) (Initial: August; ongoing)

Person Responsible Chris Burley (christopher.burley@ocps.net)

Leadership will develop a system by which teachers will track student progress, work with teachers to design instruction that includes small-group differentiation based on student needs, and help teachers empower students to track their own progress (Initial: August; ongoing)

Person Responsible Danielle Kendall (danielle.kendall@ocps.net)

Leadership will utilize resource teachers who will focus on providing support for teachers in designing appropriate and differentiated interventions within the classroom while also working directly with students in small groups who are in need of additional academic support in Language Arts, Mathematics, and Exceptional Student Education. (Ongoing)

Person Responsible Chris Burley (christopher.burley@ocps.net)

Leadership will utilize Program Assistants to assist with targeted interventions within the school day for students in the lowest 25% of ELA and Mathematics. (Initial: August; ongoing)

Person Responsible Danielle Kendall (danielle.kendall@ocps.net)

School leadership and instructional staff will receive support and collaborate with Corrective Programs to increase teacher capacity and narrow the achievement gap. As a result of our initial Corrective Programs Walk, we will collaborate to develop an Action Plan that will address the following in each content area, teacher planning, Standards-based Instruction, HOT Questions, planned checks for understanding, data analysis, data chats, reteaching, instructional coaching, instructional delivery, and scaffolding.

Person Responsible Chris Burley (christopher.burley@ocps.net)

Leadership will use principles of responsive facilitation to support and implement the cycles of professional learning (plan, implement, monitor, and modify). As part of this process, leadership will monitor the implementation of small-group differentiation strategies through observation and data analysis, provide targeted feedback to teachers for improvement, and engage teachers in ongoing professional development within common planning times and instructional coaching cycles. (Ongoing)

Person Responsible Isolda Fisher (isolda.antoniofisher@ocps.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**Area of Focus**

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

Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students.
Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: number of students with a daily rate of attendance less than 90%, and the number of students with a course failure in ELA or Mathematics.

Measurable**Outcome:**

State the specific measurable

outcome the school plans to achieve.

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The number of students with a daily rate of attendance less than 90% will decrease by 10% and the number of students with a course failure in ELA or Mathematics will decrease by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

Union Park MS will utilize the existing tools and resources within the annual Panorama surveys and periodic Character Lab polls.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Isolda Fisher (isolda.antoniofisher@ocps.net)

Evidence-

based

Strategy:

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

Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, school environment observations, attendance reports, and report cards. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

Rationale for

Evidence-

based

Strategy:

Explain the

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership

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

model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational needs.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Conduct monthly SEL Professional Development with staffulty to promote social emotional wellbeing among staffulty and students.

Person

Responsible

Chris Burley (christopher.burley@ocps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:****Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Instructional practice, specifically targeting our school's subgroups, and geared toward student engagement, encompasses students being cognitively engaged in the content. It also allows student opportunities to process individually and in groups in order to understand new content and practice and deepen their understanding of new content.

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

The goal for the 2022-23 school year is to increase the rate of proficiency, as measured by state assessments, for: ELA from 31% to 50%, Mathematics from 36% to 50%, Civics from 54% to 60%, and Science from 28% to 45%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through weekly classroom visits, corrective program analysis, and collected common formative and summative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Isolda Fisher (isolda.antoniofisher@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:**Describe the evidence-based strategy being**

To help reach the diversity of our school's ESSA Subgroups, UPMS will provide teachers with differentiated training and ongoing, embedded professional development on processing and monitoring structures. The 2022-23 school year will be used to deepen teacher knowledge and improve their practices in these engaging strategies: differentiating instruction, collaborative structures that promote processing, and practice structures that allow teachers to effectively monitor for student understanding.

**implemented
for this Area
of Focus.**

Rationale for

**Evidence-
based**

Strategy:

**Explain the
rationale for
selecting
this specific
strategy.**

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

In reviewing the 2021-22 ESSA data, there were six subgroups (white, black, Hispanic, SWD, ELLs, and Economically disadvantaged) that fell below the 41% proficiency threshold. Observational data from that year indicated that standards were being taught, but progress monitoring data indicated that learning was not taking place. It had been determined that professional development in engaging students in standards-based learning tasks that promote processing and allow for teachers to monitor for student understanding was needed. During the 21-22 school year, the focus was on the research-based strategy of academic conversations to engage students in academic discourse, engaging students in groups to create a smaller, more individualized setting, and Kagan structures to equip teachers with strategies designed to improve cooperative learning. This worked well as we saw projected improvements in student outcomes (i.e. through observation and MOY data), and we plan on continuing and extending the work from last year.

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.

Leadership will work with teachers of all content areas to increase their capacities related to student engagement in standards-based learning tasks which include structures that support processing and monitoring. Further, leadership will work with all content area teachers to ensure that opportunities for academic discourse are thoroughly planned and implemented with fidelity. This will improve the overall instruction received by all students, including the identified ESSA subgroups (White, Black, Hispanic, SWD, ELLs, and Economically Disadvantaged) (Initial: August/September; ongoing)

Person

Responsible

Danielle Kendall (danielle.kendall@ocps.net)

Leadership will plan and implement monthly professional development connecting classroom practice centering on student engagement in standards-based learning tasks, which include structures that support processing and monitoring, with the Marzano Framework. Specific elements that will be addressed are: Helping Students Process New Content; Helping Students Examine Their Reasoning; Helping Students Practice Skills, Strategies, and Processes; Helping Students Revise Knowledge.

Person

Responsible

Chris Burley (christopher.burley@ocps.net)

School leadership and instructional staff will receive support and collaborate with Corrective Programs to increase teacher capacity and narrow the achievement gap. As a result of our initial Corrective Programs Walk, we will collaborate to develop an Action Plan that will address the following in each content area: teacher planning, Standards-based Instruction, HOT Questions, planned checks for understanding, data analysis, data chats, reteaching, instructional coaching, instructional delivery, scaffolding.

Person

Responsible

Chris Burley (christopher.burley@ocps.net)

Leadership will use principles of responsive facilitation to support and implement the cycles of professional learning (plan, implement, monitor, and modify). As part of this process, leadership will monitor the implementation of small-group differentiation strategies through observation and data analysis, provide targeted feedback to teachers for improvement, and engage teachers in ongoing professional development within common planning times and instructional coaching cycles. (Ongoing)

Person Responsible Isolda Fisher (isolda.antoniofisher@ocps.net)

Leadership will collaborate with Core Connections to provide ELA and Reading teachers with comprehensive writing training. Teachers will participate in 3 training sessions and 1 coaching/modeling session. Trainings will help teachers engage students in practicing the writing process. This process includes text annotation, planning for writing, and writing academic paragraphs and full essays to demonstrate understanding of standards-based materials.

Person Responsible Danielle Kendall (danielle.kendall@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, Union Park Middle School engages in ongoing, district-wide professional learning focused on social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, our school uses social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, UPMS uses the CASEL Core Competencies to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from UPMS, which includes a mental health designee, attends this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team to individualize and implement professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs.

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

The stakeholders at UPMS include all staff members, parents, and community members. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps for promoting a positive school culture. Development of positive culture and environment will begin with the implementation of the Renaissance Program. The program includes opportunities for weekly, monthly, and quarterly student recognition. The goal of the program is to build a positive culture and environment with rewards and incentives for student success and growth.

The positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the gap between community and school culture.

In order to promote a positive school culture, Instructional coaches will attend weekly PLC meetings to support teachers in developing effective team dynamics and provide monthly Professional Development on

team building within and across grade levels. Instructional Coaches will participate in Professional Learning Communities with teachers as they build relationships to ensure the development of a positive school culture and provide professional development that will include implementation through teamwork and completion of assigned tasks and duties.

Union Park Middle School encourages the development of positive working relationships between teachers, instructional leaders, and administration through collegial planning and assessment teams. Instructional coaches are assigned to teams and help to develop team dynamics. A weekly planning period is designated for each grade level to collaboratively plan instruction of the B.E.S.T. Standards with the school's Instructional Coaches based on subject areas. During these collaborative sessions, teachers and coaches work to deconstruct the standards, create lesson plans and common assessments, and review student data. In addition to collaborative planning sessions, Professional Learning Community meeting time is set aside one day per week to continue construction of common assessments, discuss common assessment data, and discuss instructional strategies and practices (Marzano framework) that will address areas of strength and opportunities of growth based on the data. The school principal, assistant principals, and instructional coaches meet bi-weekly with grade level teams to discuss student data and strategies for maximizing student and teacher performance.

Teachers are also given an opportunity to model lessons and practice teaching strategies that they will be using in upcoming lessons. Teachers are encouraged to conduct peer observations and collaborate with one another to support professional growth and learning. The Leadership Team conducts classroom observations on a regular basis, and actionable feedback is provided to support teacher growth in a positive, constructive manner.