Orange County Public Schools

Memorial Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Memorial Middle

2220 W 29TH ST, Orlando, FL 32805

https://memorialms.ocps.net/

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.

With the support of families and the community, we create an 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, 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
Foster, Eddie	Principal	Coordinate, provide leadership, and make available desired expertise and support services that are needed to successfully support the daily functions of the school academically and operationally.
Rodriguez, Heather	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal of instruction Creates the master schedule, ensures all students have accurate schedules,; supervises Social Studies, and Electives content areas. Oversees facilities and custodial teams. Provides actionable feedback and coaching to teachers focusing on engaging standards-based instruction.
Daley, Stacyann	Assistant Principal	Support, ESE, works closely with the ELA. 6th & 7th Grade Science, Discipline team, and Lead IB School representative. Provides actionable feedback and coaching to teachers focusing on engaging standards-based instruction.
Littles, Danelle	Instructional Coach	Support teachers and administrators in using data to improve instruction on all levels. professional development targeted topics and designs. Develop coaching plans for teachers to ensure student improvement via modeling classes, teaching and technology and overseeing teacher professional development.
Brazley, Gary	Science Coach	Support teachers and administrators in using data to improve instruction on all levels. professional development targeted topics and designs. Develop coaching plans for teachers to ensure student improvement via modeling classes, teaching and technology, and overseeing teacher professional development.

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.

We will review the parent, student, and teacher stakeholder surveys from the 2022-2023 school year. Based on survey results, we will host monthly SAC meetings as well as two community town hall meetings to gauge and assess the varying needs and supports of our community. We will also share survey results of both student and parent surveys in our monthly SAC meetings as well as through our social media platforms. We've experienced a 12% improvement in parents feeling as though barriers to engagement have improved.

Survey data will be used to specifically target areas of improvement in math, ELA/reading, as well as the social emotional development of our students and teachers.

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 regularly monitored for effective implementation through explicitly designed checkpoints throughout the school year, ensuring that each program requirement is implemented with fidelity through the use of classroom walks providing actionable feedback to each teacher, PLCs, unit assessment progress monitoring, and data chats, as well as through the development and implementation of our SIP action plan which will be monitored by our instructional coaches and administration.

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	98%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
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) 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	88	137	133	358
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	143	68	276
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	20	42
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	46	94
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	141	194	158	493
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	161	111	416
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	0	0	

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	143	201	157	501

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	1	2	5	8

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	139	112	145	396
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	15	18	66
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	2	10	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	59	41	113
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	174	139	154	467
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	204	128	128	460
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	204	170	150	524

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	192	141	154	487

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	4	5	2	11

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	139	112	145	396
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	15	18	66
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	2	10	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	59	41	113
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	174	139	154	467
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	204	128	128	460
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	204	170	150	524

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	192	141	154	487

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
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	4	5	2	11

The header "Grade Level" spans columns K through 8.

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*	27	48	49	29	49	50	32		
ELA Learning Gains				38			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32			31		
Math Achievement*	35	57	56	30	36	36	30		
Math Learning Gains				56			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			34		
Science Achievement*	30	53	49	29	55	53	19		
Social Studies Achievement*	41	64	68	68	61	58	57		
Middle School Acceleration	80	77	73	78	52	49	57		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	33	43	40	34	79	76	45		

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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	246
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
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	15	Yes	4	3
ELL	36	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	42			
MUL	20	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	48			

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%
FRL	40	Yes	1	

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	27	Yes	3	2
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	49			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	29	Yes	1	1
FRL	46			

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	27			35			30	41	80			33
SWD	10			16			8	30			5	13
ELL	20			28			23	36	73		6	33
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26			34			26	40	78		6	32
HSP	29			36			40	38	79		6	32
MUL	10			30							2	

| **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
PAC												
WHT	36			60							2	
FRL	26			35			30	40	78		6	28

| **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	29	38	32	30	56	64	29	68	78			34
SWD	14	30	31	15	37	47	10	31				
ELL	18	35	34	23	55	63	20	65				34
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	39	32	28	54	61	27	65	79			27
HSP	31	37	29	35	62	76	31	77	75			41
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	33			25								
FRL	29	38	33	29	56	66	31	67	79			30

| **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	32	38	31	30	32	34	19	57	57			45
SWD	14	29	19	16	28	24	8	29				
ELL	22	41	38	19	31	39	5	51	46			45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	37	32	30	34	35	19	56	60			44
HSP	33	38	27	29	27	29	17	56	44			45
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	62	46		57	43							
FRL	30	37	29	30	30	32	19	54	57			35

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	21%	45%	-24%	47%	-26%
08	2023 - Spring	25%	46%	-21%	47%	-22%
06	2023 - Spring	23%	44%	-21%	47%	-24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	25%	53%	-28%	54%	-29%
07	2023 - Spring	28%	38%	-10%	48%	-20%
08	2023 - Spring	38%	58%	-20%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	27%	50%	-23%	44%	-17%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	47%	42%	50%	39%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	45%	55%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	35%	61%	-26%	66%	-31%

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.

ELA proficiency dropped from 29% to 26% in the 2022-2023 school year. Low performance in this area is attributed to teacher vacancies, a lack of school-based instructional coaching support, and first-year teachers participating in two international teacher exchange programs (TPG) Teacher Cultural Exchange, and (EPI) Ecology Project International.

Social studies proficiency dropped from 68% in 2021 to 40% in 2023. The contributing factor for this decrease was due to the resignation of our top-performing Civics teacher after spring break.

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

Social studies proficiency dropped from 68% to % in 2021 to 40% in 2023. The contributing factor for this decrease was due to the resignation our top-performing Civics teacher at the conclusion of spring break and our second teacher in the subject was a first year teacher to the subject.

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.

Data not available. This section will be updated once the appropriate data is available.

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

Math showed the most improvement year over year with a 9 point increase. Our school was more specific about the students that we targeted for upper level math courses to ensure success with student outcomes. We added a notetaking and corrections model to assist students with test taking strategies.

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

Based on the early warning system data two potential areas of concern are the number of students that scored a level 1 on the statewide ELA assessment in grades 6-8 as well as the number of students that scored a level 1 on the statewide math assessment in grades 6-8.

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

1. Increased focus on science and social studies scores by adding a coach to assist with instructional strategies.

2. Embed the gradual release model across all content areas.
3. Math will focus on corrections model to deepen student learning and understanding.
4. Increase positivity of school climate with students, staff and community.
5. Improve ELA instructional strategies by leading with literacy.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

Based on assessment results for the 2021-2022 school year we demonstrated 29% proficiency. For the 2022-2023 school year we demonstrated 23% proficiency. As a school, our students are performing well below grade level.

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

By focusing on the area of proficiency in ELA, we will increase student proficiency by 10%.

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

We will monitor this area for the desired outcome through the use of PMAs, benchmark assessments, and exit slips. The leadership team will meet every week to discuss progress towards the achievement of this outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eddie Foster (eddie.foster@ocps.net)

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.)

The evidence based interventions implemented for this area of focus are professional development, the use of high yield strategies, rigorous questioning, as well as effectively monitoring students for the desired effect.

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

Focusing on this strategy will ensure that learners requiring additional support will be quickly identified allowing for immediate response and support.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

The leadership team will provide support for each PLC on effectively monitoring for understanding for each lesson taught, developing standards based questions that will cultivate our students into critical thinkers, and professional learning sessions that model the effective use of instructional strategies.

Person Responsible: Stacyann Daley (stacyann.daley@ocps.net)

By When: This will be fully implemented by May 2024.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

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.

Based on assessment results for the 2021-2022 school year we demonstrated 68% proficiency. For the 2022-2023 school year we demonstrated 40% proficiency. This year students will also be tested on new Civics standards which will directly impact our social studies proficiency score.

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

By focusing on the area of proficiency in Social Studies, we will increase student proficiency by 15%.

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

We will monitor this area for the desired outcome through the use of PMAs, benchmark assessments, and exit slips. The leadership team will meet on a weekly basis to discuss progress towards achievement of this outcome. We will directly focus on student progression on the newly installed Civics standards to ensure that any misconceptions are corrected prior to the assessment in May.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eddie Foster (eddie.foster@ocps.net)

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.)

The evidence based interventions implemented for this area of focus are professional development, the use of high yield strategies, rigorous questioning, as well as effectively monitoring students for the desired effect.

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

Focusing on this strategy will ensure that learners requiring additional support will be quickly identified allowing for immediate response and support.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

The leadership team will provide support for each PLC on effectively monitoring for understanding for each lesson taught, developing standards based questions that will cultivate our students into critical thinkers, and professional learning sessions that model the effective use of instructional strategies.

Person Responsible: Heather Rodriguez (heather.rodriguez@ocps.net)

By When: This will be fully implemented by May 2024.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Based on the Panorama Survey teachers responded 42% stating the coaching and feedback that they receive is quality and frequent. They also rated the overall social and learning climate of the school 27%.

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

We would like to increase the perception of coaching and feedback from 42% to 60%. We would also like to increase the perception of the school climate from 29% to 50%.

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

We will monitor this area for the desired outcome through the use of stakeholder surveys and quarterly faculty feedback surveys. The leadership team will meet on a weekly basis to discuss progress towards achievement of this outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eddie Foster (eddie.foster@ocps.net)

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.)

The evidence based intervention implemented for this area of focus is clear and frequent communication with all stakeholders. As well as receiving stakeholder input and involvement in both school and community initiatives.

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

Focusing on this strategy will ensure that stakeholders understand the vision, mission, values, and goals allowing them to directly take part in positively impacting the school culture and environment.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

The instructional coaches and administrators will provide explicit, immediate, and consistent actionable feedback to instructional staff members. We also review the survey results from quarterly faculty feedback surveys and implement "Wellness Wednesday" once a month to address the social and emotional wellness of faculty and staff members.

Person Responsible: Stacyann Daley (stacyann.daley@ocps.net)

By When: This will be fully implemented by May 2024.

#4. 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 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.

Based on assessment results for the 2021-2022 school year SWD demonstrated 3% proficiency in reading. For the 2022-2023 school year they've demonstrated 7% proficiency in reading.

For the 2021-2022 school year ELL demonstrated 0% proficiency reading. For the 2022-2023 school year they've demonstrated 2% proficiency in reading.

For the 2021-2022 school year WHT demonstrated 25% proficiency in reading. For the 2022-2023 school year they've demonstrated 19% proficiency in reading.

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

By making these specific areas of need a focus, we will increase student proficiency for SWD by 5%, ELL by 8%, WHT by 11%.

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

We will monitor this area for the desired outcome through the use of PMAs, benchmark assessments, and exit slips. The leadership team will meet on a weekly basis to discuss progress towards achievement of this outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

The evidence based interventions implemented for this area of focus are professional development, the use of high yield strategies, rigorous questioning, as well as effectively monitoring students for the desired effect.

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

Focusing on this strategy will ensure that learners requiring additional support will be quickly identified allowing for immediate response and support.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

The leadership team will provide support for each PLC on effectively monitoring for understanding for each lesson taught, developing standards based questions that will cultivate our students into critical thinkers, and professional learning sessions that model the effective use of instructional strategies.

Person Responsible: Eddie Foster (eddie.foster@ocps.net)

By When: This will be fully implemented by May 2024.

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).

Memorial Middle School meaningfully engages stakeholders in the design, implementation, and monitoring of supports for continuous improvement by implementing a cycle of growth that is focused on results that fosters a culture of evidence-based policies and practices.

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.

Dissemination of the SIP will be done at our monthly School Advisory Council Meetings. Our school SIP will also be posted on our school website: https://memorialms.ocps.net. We will also post progress check on our SIP in our bi-weekly school community brief that is emailed to all stakeholders.

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 school plans to build positive relations with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission by providing them with a level of transparency, input, and access to our school that makes all stakeholders feel part of the school family.

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 to strengthen the academic program in the school by implementing the gradual release model into all content areas, providing actionable feedback to teachers through classroom walkthroughs, as well as through the use of interactive notebooks in all content areas.

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))

This plan directly supports the following:
- violence prevention program through our use of our PBIS rewards system and Restorative justice.
- nutrition program by following state and district nutrition requirements
- career and technical education programs through provision of our Information and Communication Technology Essentials 1 and 2 course offerings.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

We provide students with opportunities to improve skills outside of the academic subject areas through our athletic programs, Restorative Justice, as well as our mentoring and community partnerships (City Year, Elevate, Dream Academy, and My Brother's Keeper).

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We will utilize the following programs and models to prevent and address problem behaviors: Dream Academy mentorship, My Brother's Keeper, peer mentorship, soldier bucks and school store, Restorative Justice, and PBIS Rewards.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Instructional personnel will engage in professional learning opportunities though pre-preplanning and preplanning sessions, professional learning communities on a weekly basis, as well as monthly faculty meetings geared towards data and instructional strategies.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	Reading Coach		0151 - Memorial Middle	General Fund		$0.00
	ELA Coach		0151 - Memorial Middle	General Fund		$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies				$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	Instructional Coach		0151 - Memorial Middle	General Fund		$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment				$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	School Newsletter		0151 - Memorial Middle	General Fund		$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$0.00
					Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No