

Orange County Public Schools

Ocoee Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Ocoee Middle

300 S BLUFORD AVE, Ocoee, FL 34761

<https://ocoeems.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 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
Leavitt, Cheri	Principal	Oversees curriculum and instructions to ensure standard aligned instruction with researched based practices are used throughout the school. Oversees facilitates to ensure the school environment is safe and conducive for learning. Leads the leadership team at the school to implement the school improvement plan, provides administrative professional development, oversees the school budget, supervises the assistant principals, deans, all curriculum teams, SAFE department, and facilities.
Frohmborg, Andrew	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Instruction, assists in building the master schedule and completes the documentation for FTE, supervises registration, attendance, guidance department, science and social studies, physical education department, agriculture, band, orchestra, and project lead the way.
Green, Ava	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, assists in building the master schedule and completes the documentation for FTE, supervises ELA, Reading, CTE, Photography, AVID, PASS, Art, drama, Spanish, and ESE.
Shaw, Amber	Dean	Dean of students, oversees all discipline for 8th grade students, Title IX contact, monitors the progress of her focus group of students, incentive for teachers and students and collaborates to support the MTSS team.
Hulcher, Liana	Staffing Specialist	Reviews ESE Referrals and placement document; works with leadership team to ensure accuracy and completion of documentation; facilitates eligibility and placement meetings and serves as the representative for the development, revision and annual reviews of the Individual Educational Plan (IEP).
Mondesir, Mari	ELL Compliance Specialist	Data analysis and progress monitoring for ELL student population; provide accommodations and modification resources; professional development to support ELL students; ELL documentation, parent/teacher meetings and disaggregation of assessment data.

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.

Through collaboration during faculty meetings and involvement with the community, the SIP was developed to ensure academic and social-emotional goals are met. To prepare our faculty to meet these goals, the leadership team will develop professional development and provide them with research-based strategies and resources that aid them in their classrooms and instructional practices.

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))

Administrators and instructional coaches will attend all PLC meetings for ELA, Science, Civics, Mathematics, and electives teams to collaborate with teachers and monitor standard-aligned instruction and data discussions of weekly common assessments. Quarterly PMAs and PMs will be used to monitor student growth in ELA, Math, Civics, and Science, and that data will be used to help teachers adjust their lessons and activities. Small groups and differentiation will target ESSA subgroups (lowest 25, ELL, ESE, and MTSS students). The leadership team will monitor standard-aligned instruction and research-based strategies through classroom walks and provide actionable feedback to support teachers in their practices.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	83%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) Pacific Islander Students (PAC) 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: B 2018-19: B 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	69	78	105	252
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	65	109	198
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	41	52
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	127	157	395
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	80	101	315
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	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	113	102	152	367

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4

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	82	120	131	333
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	58	41	110
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	15	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	9	36
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	134	129	375
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	125	153	375
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	0

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	92	143	149	384

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	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	8

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	82	120	131	333
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	58	41	110
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	15	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	9	36
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	134	129	375
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	125	153	375
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	0

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	92	143	149	384

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	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	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*	41	48	49	41	49	50	45		
ELA Learning Gains				47			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			26		
Math Achievement*	49	57	56	42	36	36	42		
Math Learning Gains				56			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			28		
Science Achievement*	46	53	49	50	55	53	43		
Social Studies Achievement*	63	64	68	63	61	58	59		
Middle School Acceleration	68	77	73	60	52	49	56		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	45	43	40	38	79	76	30		

** 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	312
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	484
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	17	Yes	4	2
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	49			
HSP	50			
MUL	49			
PAC	33	Yes	1	
WHT	65			
FRL	47			

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	23	Yes	3	1
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	66			
BLK	49			
HSP	45			
MUL	64			
PAC	55			
WHT	53			
FRL	43			

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	41			49			46	63	68			45
SWD	13			19			8	28			4	
ELL	25			38			29	45	78		6	45
AMI												
ASN	69			79				90			3	
BLK	40			47			39	66	55		5	
HSP	37			45			45	52	76		6	43
MUL	44			53							2	
PAC	25			40							2	
WHT	50			61			65	75	73		5	
FRL	35			45			40	56	66		6	41

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	41	47	35	42	56	52	50	63	60			38
SWD	9	29	26	5	40	48	11	15				
ELL	21	37	31	24	48	54	28	44	61			38
AMI												
ASN	61	66		70	62		65	70	67			
BLK	38	46	38	37	56	54	52	65	59			
HSP	37	41	31	38	52	48	43	56	62			40
MUL	67	64		57	69							
PAC	42	57		44	77							
WHT	51	51	36	52	58	51	54	71	53			
FRL	33	42	35	35	54	51	41	58	52			33

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	45	43	26	42	31	28	43	59	56			30
SWD	9	27	24	9	26	26	19	24				
ELL	17	27	22	17	21	25	8	36	36			30
AMI												
ASN	65	54		76	48		75	73	78			
BLK	46	46	34	37	26	24	41	63	50			
HSP	41	38	19	38	29	27	35	49	54			33
MUL	57	57		64	50							
PAC	50			60								
WHT	47	41	22	48	38	35	45	67	55			
FRL	37	36	22	33	27	29	29	49	52			29

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	32%	45%	-13%	47%	-15%
08	2023 - Spring	41%	46%	-5%	47%	-6%
06	2023 - Spring	42%	44%	-2%	47%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	53%	53%	0%	54%	-1%
07	2023 - Spring	27%	38%	-11%	48%	-21%
08	2023 - Spring	49%	58%	-9%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	45%	50%	-5%	44%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	47%	33%	50%	30%

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	60%	61%	-1%	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.

Based on the 2023 FAST ELA assessment, 38% of students in grades 6-8 demonstrated proficiency. Factors contributing to this low performance are adjusting to new standards and state assessments, new district resources, and ELL proficiency.

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

ELA proficiency, due to a decline of 3% of proficient students from the 21-22 school year. Factors contributing to this low performance are adjusting to new standards and state assessments, new district resources, and ELL proficiency.

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.

ELA proficiency due to the 9% gap between OMS proficiency and the state average. Factors contributing to this low performance are adjusting to new standards and state assessments, new district resources, and ELL proficiency.

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

Math showed the most improvement of 3% in proficiency from the 21-22 school year. The school focused on using and adjusting an instructional focus calendar, use of data as a tool to guide instruction, small group instruction based on in-the-moment monitoring, weekly to bi-weekly progress monitoring, and focused discussion during PLC on tier 1 instruction.

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

Attendance and suspensions.

There has been a reduction of student absenteeism from 333 to 251 students with 10% or more absent days in the 22-23 school year, but that is still an area of concern, along with suspensions, as both of these factors reduce the number of days they receive instruction.

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. Use of data to guide instructional practices
4. Positive behavior practices with students who have disciplinary infractions.
5. Instructional support to ELL and ESE students.

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 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.

To help support our teachers and students with the instruction of students with disabilities (SWD) and English Language Learners (ELL), the leadership team will collaborate with our staffing specialist our ECS (ELL compliance specialist) and the ESE/ELL teachers to develop the skill and knowledge needed to understand the resources and tools available to them to support SWD and ELL students. This will help our new teachers understand what specific accommodations or supports a student needs, how those accommodations should be provided, and how to record and monitor evidence and data in accordance to ELL and ESE documentation.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school plans to recruit future teachers that have experience in best practices that support ELL and SWD students and train our current teachers in best practices that support ELL and SWD student learning. Ocoee Middle School will see an increase to where 75% of the new teachers utilize practices such as visual learning, non-linguistic processing activities, use of English Language Learner resources such as dictionaries and resources that support students with disabilities such as read-alouds scripts, modified assignments, alternative assignments and multimodal methods to learn or answer through. This help the students in the ELL or SWD program learn in the context of the content they are learning. By spring of 2024 the panorama survey results will show that 60% of our teachers (an increase of 7% from 22-23 school year) feel a positive culture at Ocoee Middle School.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will conduct classroom walks and coaching observations with the target of seeing the resources and strategies listed above. The leadership team will provide actionable feedback to teachers regarding their use of these strategies, with clear targets to improve upon. The leadership team will also look for teachers who are using these strategies and resources well to model and support other teachers and create a positive and collaborative culture. The leadership team will use FAST PM 1 and 2 data from Math and ELA, and common assessment data to track and compare growth over the year for each ELL and SWD student. As we approach the final FAST PM in the spring (PM 3) we will collaborate with the ELA and Math teachers to use this data and create specific plans as needed and to assure these students reach attainable learning goals throughout the 23-24 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cheri Leavitt (cheri.godek@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 leadership team will provide targeted professional developments to the instructional staff focusing on how to support the learning of ELL and ESE students, this will support teachers confidence in their skills and build a professional culture. We will use incentive programs to encourage teacher attendance, and encourage collaboration. To build a positive culture, we are also involving the staff in school wide decisions so that everyone feels they have a say and a part in where Ocoee Middle is going.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to build a positive culture, the staff needs to feel empowered, supported and confident. The teachers will feel supported and confident as we train them on best practices and they will feel empowered by providing their input and help plan and implement the decisions at the school.

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.

Targeted professional developments to the instructional staff focusing on how to support the learning of ELL and ESE students

Person Responsible: Cheri Leavitt (cheri.godek@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly/ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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.

An area of focus Ocoee Middle will target is standard aligned instructional practices that will focus on strategies that support English Language Learners (ELL) and Students With Disabilities (SWD).

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school plans to increase the number of proficient students in the ELL and ESE subgroups by 5% in both ELA and Math. This would equate to an average of 6-7% proficiency in ELA by FAST PM 3 for the 23-24 school year, and a 19% proficiency in math by FAST PM 3 for the 23-24 school year for ELL students, and a 46% proficiency in ELA by FAST PM 3 for the 23-24 school year, and a 39% proficiency in Math by FAST PM 3 for the 23-24 school year for ESE students.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team at Ocoee Middle School will monitor this desired outcome by attending PLCs, walking classrooms and providing actionable feedback, and guiding teachers through data focused discussion to help teachers guide their lessons and activities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cheri Leavitt (cheri.godek@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 leadership team will use FAST PM 1 and 2 data for Math and ELA, along with common assessment data throughout each unit specific to ELL and ESE students. This data will be used to track and compare growth over the year for each ELL and ESE student to monitor student progress as we approach the final FAST PM in the spring (PM 3). We will collaborate with the ELA and Math teachers to use this data and create specific plans as needed and to assure these students reach attainable learning goals throughout the 23-24 school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We chose to use these resources because they are district approved, and provide specific instruction and activities to help students grow based on their specific needs.

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.

The Leadership team will provide quarterly professional developments that focus on best practices of instruction, with focuses on ELL and ESE strategies. These professional developments will be built around

what is observed in the classroom, the feedback provided, and the areas of improvement identified based on Math and ELA PM 1 and 2 for the 23-24 school year.

Person Responsible: Cheri Leavitt (cheri.godek@ocps.net)

By When: By the end of the 3rd quarter of the 23-24 school year to prepare for the FAST PM 3 for Math and ELA.

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).

Our leadership team and school administration examines our instructional allocations and staffing for instructional positions in order to properly support the needs of the students at Ocoee Middle School. Necessary decision making is completed within time frames provided by the district to support the learning needs of all students, and what additional needs necessary for the growth of subgroups such as ELL, ESE and varying economic status. The leadership team at Ocoee Middle School will analyze and disaggregate data from historical and current (23-24) assessments for ELA, Math, Science and CIVICs state tests, and subgroup data of low socio-economic status, ELL, ESE and other indicators to determine what additional resources that may be needed to support standard-aligned instruction.