Marion County Public Schools

Ocali Charter Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Ocali Charter Middle School

3233 SE MARICAMP RD STE 106, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to help middle school students reach their greatest potential for academic, emotional, and personal success by combining individual learning styles, gifts, and talents with comprehensive curriculum and high-achieving standards in a micro-school setting.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to create high-achieving schools that inspire and motivate students to become life-long learners, responsible citizens, and positive role models in their communities. By minimizing classroom size, our micro-school concept provides opportunities for more individualized learning, safer school environments, and diverse thought and participation.

We believe education is not limited to the classroom, and envision partnerships with community leaders, business owners, parents, and other individuals in creating opportunities for exploration, community participation, and experiential learning.

Our vision includes creating a positive, inviting, and inspiring workplace for instructors and those working in education by creating opportunities for professional development, personalized teaching techniques, and competitive compensation. Motivated teachers motivate students.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Matthews, Theresa	Executive Director	1.Oversee the Middle School principal duties 2. Manage the school wide budget to maximize resources to improve student achievement. 3. Fundraise. 4. Design a master schedule that will maximize instructional time and support the diverse needs of the students.
Posth, Elias		1. Provide leadership in the areas of curriculum, instruction, and assessment. 2. Ensure that classroom instruction is delivered in a manner appropriate to the needs of middle school aged students and is provided by skilled and knowledgeable teachers. 3. Deliver professional development and technical assistance based on the needs of faculty and staff. 4. Assign, train, observe and evaluate all instructional and non-instructional staff. 5. Create a supportive learning environment that promotes high standards for student conduct. 6. Cultivate a culture of collaboration amongst students, staff, parents and community through Title I and other resources. 7. Recognize and honor outstanding students in the school. 8. Use of data to make informed decisions towards student improvement needs. 9. Other duties as assigned by the Executive Director
Sheib, Stephanie		1. Oversee staff in the development and the implementation of student discipline and classroom management plan. 2. Assist Principal in promoting a school culture focused on student achievement. 3. Manage Tier II & Tier III interventions 4. Communicate with parents about specific student and staff concerns. 5. Assist in interviewing, hiring, and training of teaching staff. 6. Supervise and facilitate school events as directed by the Principal (parent night, student activity events) 7. Liaison with the School Resource Officer, outside service providers, and school counselors as needed.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team met with a parent and the OCMS board to discuss the current state of the school and proposed solutions to close the learning gap as indicated by the 22-23 FAST PM 3 results. A follow up to adjusting this SIP will be to include teachers and students in the review of the plan and make any necessary adjustments based on their feedback during our SAC meeting in September. Additionally,

information from our 1st 23-24 Title I parent engagement event survey will be used to make any necessary additional adjustments to the SIP.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored quarterly by analyzing the FAST PM 1, PM 2, and PM 3 data to ensure that progress towards the set forth goals is occurring. The stakeholders will also meet to determine the effectiveness of the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III interventions. For those Tier II and Tier III, students with large achievement gaps and our student subgroups (SWD, ELL, BIK), weekly IXL Reading and Math data will be analyzed by the interventionist to determine its effectiveness as well as overall student growth towards the 10% increase goals documented in the 22-23 SIP.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	55%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	98%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	17	19	50
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	23	18	49
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	21	35
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	30	20	62
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	29	16	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	47	39	119

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	53	49	128

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	17	18	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	15	8	50
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	16	7	49
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	7	5	45
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	24	22	79
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	16	15	62
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	44	99

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	13	12	56

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	17	18	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	15	8	50
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	16	7	49
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	7	5	45
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	24	22	79
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	16	15	62
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	44	99

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	13	12	56

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	37	40	49	28	42	50	36		
ELA Learning Gains				32			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			47		
Math Achievement*	44	48	56	37	30	36	28		
Math Learning Gains				48			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			57		
Science Achievement*	20	40	49	27	45	53	25		
Social Studies Achievement*	60	61	68	59	49	58	47		
Middle School Acceleration	78	71	73	81	41	49	50		
Graduation Rate					40	49			
College and Career Acceleration					64	70			
ELP Progress		36	40		69	76			

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	239
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	388
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	14	Yes	3	3
ELL	35	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	23	Yes	4	3
HSP	56			
MUL	27	Yes	2	1
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	45			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	21	Yes	2	2
ELL	19	Yes	3	3
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	3	2
HSP	44			
MUL	35	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	45			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	37			44			20	60	78			
SWD	18			23			0				3	
ELL	30			40							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19			26							2	
HSP	40			54			45	60	83		5	
MUL	23			31							2	
PAC												
WHT	45			45			13	68	68		5	
FRL	31			42			17	56	78		5	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	28	32	35	37	48	41	27	59	81			
SWD	3	24	32	14	33	33		7				
ELL	0	15		23	38							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21	31		10	30	40		54				
HSP	31	33	27	49	62	60	11	77				
MUL	40			30								
PAC												
WHT	28	31	41	39	48	36	39	53	87			
FRL	25	29	31	37	48	36	25	58	70			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	36	46	47	28	40	57	25	47	50			
SWD	7	30	36	10	35							
ELL	9	30		9	45							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	46		3	23		0					
HSP	40	47	27	26	46		21	50				
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	35	43	50	38	43	62	35	56				
FRL	36	51	55	25	41	60	19	37				

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	39%	37%	2%	47%	-8%
08	2023 - Spring	34%	38%	-4%	47%	-13%
06	2023 - Spring	32%	36%	-4%	47%	-15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	27%	44%	-17%	54%	-27%
07	2023 - Spring	51%	41%	10%	48%	3%
08	2023 - Spring	34%	45%	-11%	55%	-21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	20%	37%	-17%	44%	-24%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	81%	44%	37%	50%	31%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	43%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	58%	2%	66%	-6%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The area that showed the lowest proficiency was the 8th Grade Science NGSSS assessment. OCMS Science performance dropped 7% from 27% proficiency in 2022 to 20% proficiency in 2023. Factors that contributed to the lowest Science performance in the history of OMCS, is solid classroom instruction was not present in the 8th grade physical science classes during the 22-23 school year. One physical science position was filled by a teacher that was activated for military duty and was replaced with a permanent substitute. The other physical science position was filled after the 1st quarter with a teacher that was out of area and no science teaching experience. For both science classes the needed, high-level instruction required to master the science standards was lacking.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The greatest decline in performance came from the 8th Grade Science NGSSS assessment. OCMS Science performance dropped 7% from 27% proficiency in 2022 to 20% proficiency in 2023. Factors that contributed to the lowest Science performance in the history of OMCS, is solid classroom instruction was not present in the 8th grade physical science classes during the 22-23 school year. One physical science position was filled by a teacher that was activated for military duty and was replaced with a permanent substitute. The other physical science position was filled after the 1st quarter with a teacher that was out of area and no science teaching experience. For both science classes the needed, high-level instruction required to master the science standards was lacking.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap in performance between OCMS and the state average was in the Algebra 1 EOC. In 2023, OCMS had 81% of its students enrolled in Algebra I Honors score proficient. The state average in 2023 was 48% proficient. The 33% gap is attributed to the instructional methods the teacher uses to reach her students and have them achieve mastery on the Algebra 1 standards.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The greatest area of improvement was in the 8th grade Pre Algebra FAST assessment. During the 22-23 schoolyear, all previous year proficient math students were placed in Algebra 1 while all previous years non-proficient Math students were placed in Pre-Algebra. During the 22-23 FAST Math PM 1, no students were proficient. This lack of performance elevated to 19% proficiency on the FAST Math PM 2 by January. The final 22-23 FAST Math PM 3 in May showed that 34% of Pre Algebra students were not proficient. OCMS attributes these gains to the additional Fundamental Math course that all OCMS students were enrolled in during the 22-23 school year. Through collaboration between the regular math teachers and the fundamental math teacher, math areas students struggled in became the area of focus in Fundamental Math. Fundamental Math bridged the gap between lower-level math standards and current 8th grade math standards. Additionally, Fundamental Math also incorporated hands on STEM activities to bridge the gap between math theory and real world math applications. We believe that this methodology assisted students in understanding some math standards.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The two areas of concern both target instructional time lost. In order to close learning gaps in reading and math the OCMS attendance rate has to improve. Along those same lines, behaviors that lead to suspensions also has to improve as this affects instructional time lost.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Better oversight of Tier II and Tier III interventions in Math and Reading.
2. Increasing students reading endurance.
3. Create a cordial learning culture that is consistent in all classrooms.
4. Improve on the Fundamental Math program to continue closing gaps in Math learning.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Postive culture and environment through parent involvement is an area of focus because it impacts the low performing students that have poor attendance or behavior that results in suspensions, thus, also affecting poor attendance.

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

OCMS plans to achieve a 10% improvement in attendance by reducing the number of students (SY22-23 50 students) that were absent 10% or more of the school year. Our goal is that less than 45 students fall under this early warning category. OCMS also wants a 10% reduction in students receiving 1 day or more of out-of-school suspensions (SY22-23 49 students). Our goal is less then 44 students fall under this early warning category.

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

Attendance will be monitored by using attendance reports in skyward. Behaviors that lead to suspensions will also be monitored using skyward. OCMS will directly contact parents of students that are at risk of falling under either absenteeism or suspension categories. During our 4 parent engagement events troughout the 23-24 school year, an emphasis on attendance and following our SOAR (Safe Organized Attentive Respectful) expectations will be made in order to prevent future behaviors that lead to suspensions..

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Stephanie Sheib (stephanie.sheib@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

As an area of focus, increasing parent involvement through mailings, parent engagement events, and direct communication through social services, have been proven methods to increase attendance to school as well as creating allies for parental support with regards to student behaviors.which should reduce out-of-school suspensions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale behind this strategy is if OCMS can gain parent support for attendance and behavior because parents will see the importance of instructional time, then they will make their child's education a priority by getting their kids to school as well as ensuring their behavior keeps them there.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. After 5 unexcused attendance days, an attendance letter will go home.

2. After a total of 10 unexcused and/or excused absent days, a problem solving intervention meeting will take place. A social worker and parent will be invited to attend the meeting.

3. If the lack of attendance is due to out-of-school suspensions, then a problem-solving meeting will occur to address the behaviors that lead to those suspensions. The meeting will take place with the parents, student, and school administration.

4. If parent involvement and support in attendance or behavior are not achieved, then OCMS will follow the process to have that student return to their base school.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Sheib (stephanie.sheib@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: On going, Weekly. On a needs basis.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

OCMS data shows that 73% of 6th graders, 49% of 7th graders, and 66% of non accelerated 8th graders where non profcient on their last PM3 FAST Math assessment. Specifically, the ELL, black, and SWD subgroups which coincidentally also were part of our bottom quartile, did not demonstrate proficiency in Math.

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

OCMS optimistically plans to achieve a 10% increase in achievement at each Progress Monitoring checkpoint (PM 1- PM 3) for each grade level. The goal is by PM3 47% of 6th graders (up from 27% during SY22-23), 71% of 7th graders (up from 34% during SY22-23) , and 54% (up from 34% during SY22-23) of non accelerated 8th graders will be proficient in Math.

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

The instructional math team along with the teacher assistants will continue to collaborate with each other to provide math remediation which will include project-based math concepts, a ratio of 1:5 tutoring, and the IXL computer-based math interventions. This will retain the interest and motivate the ELL, SWD, and Black subgroups that struggle learning Math concepts when it is only based on textbook instruction, to better learn the assessed math standards. OCMS will use the trend from the 22-23 PM3 results and compare it to the 23-24 PM 1 results. Once students complete their PM2, that data will be compared to PM1. Utilizing Math IXL, the Math instructor will progress monitor student gains and mastery towards specific standards that needed to be revisited based on the data the FAST assessments indicated. Every effort will be made to take the theoretical math concepts and apply them to real life concepts.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Stephanie Sheib (stephanie.sheib@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

According to John Hattie's review of research, high impact learning occurs when creative programming is implemented along with self-regulation and metacognition of project-based learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

High interest, project-based learning and varying instructional modalities combines the necessary standards that students must master and makes those concepts relevant, those more engaging to learn and remember.

Comprehensive project-based learning:
-is organized around an open-ended driving question or challenge.
-creates a need to know essential content and skills.
-requires inquiry to learn and/or create something new.
-requires critical thinking, problem solving, collaboration, and various forms of communication
-allows of student voice and choice.
-incorporates feedback and revision.
-results in a publicly presented product

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

1. Identify the lowest quartile
2. Within the lowest quartile, identify the subgroups SWD, ELL, and black students that preform the lowest on the FAST assessments.
3. Provide additional intervention time that will include hands on project based learning with IXL interventions.
4. Utilize paraprofessionals to create small learning groups so that lower quartile and subgroup students get the individual learning they need.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Sheib (stephanie.sheib@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: At the completion of each FAST Progress Monitoring assessment.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

As part of the school improvement process, our funding and resources are review with our board, leadership team, and other stakeholders to ensure that our areas of focus are supported through any funds needs for interventions to support our ESSA subgroups.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The 23-24 SIP is available for the all stakeholers to view on our school website, https://www.ocalicharter.com/title-one. Additionally, OCMS will utilize our Instagram and facebook pages to advertise the SIP access on our webpage. A hard copy of the SIP will also be available in the front

office and during all 4 of our parent engagement events. Basic data that indicates progress towards our SIP goals will also be shared at 3 of those parent engagement events.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The 23-24 OCMS family engagement plan is available for all stakeholders to view on our school website: https://www.ocalicharter.com/title-one. During all of OCMS' parent engagement events, direct parental involvement in school life will be encouraged through sharing of data and volunteer opportunities. Two of the engagement events focuses on conferencing with parents to give them detailed information as well as student specific resources that can be used to bridge the gap between school and home.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

The school plans on strengthening its academic program, specifically in math, by utilizing our Fundamental Math class that all students are enrolled in, and developing it into a STEM lab that incorporates both remedial math and enrichment opportunities depending on the students FAST math level. The quality of learning time of our program will also increase as we focus on reducing attendance and suspensions that negatively impact instructional time for our lowest quartile and lower performing subgroups.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

NA