

Orange County Public Schools

Glenridge 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Glenridge Middle

2900 UPPER PARK RD, Orlando, FL 32814

<https://glenridgems.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.

Glenridge Middle School strives 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
Kempinger, Daniel	Principal	Oversees all aspects of the school and communicates with all stakeholders to ensure shared decision making. Oversees Assistant Principals, Resource Teachers, Classified Staff, Math Department and Foreign Language Teachers.
Bispott, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	Oversees school discipline, safety and operations, facilities, and Digital Device initiatives. Oversees Science, Social Studies, CTE and Physical Ed. Departments.
Rojas, Mariela	Math Coach	Monitors the identification of students in the bottom 30 percent in math schoolwide. Works with the testing coordinator to provide professional development and supports teachers and administrators in their deliberate practice. Leads the math department and monitors student data and implementation of a research-based intervention.
Oquendo, Iris	Instructional Coach	Monitors the identification of students in the bottom 30 percent schoolwide. Works with the testing coordinator to provide professional development and supports teachers and administrators in their deliberate practice. Leads the English department and monitors student data and implementation of a research-based intervention.
Livingston-Taylor, Melissa	Other	Student Support - SAFE Coordinator - Responsible for coordinating counseling services for students, working with students in crisis, and coordinating services of support for students and families. Coordinates with administration in leading the threat assessment team.
Hames, Nigel	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of instruction. Oversees campus student services including school counselors and SAFE, Language Arts Department, IB, ESE Department and Fine Arts. Responsible for FTE, scheduling, credit recovery, and ensuring appropriate course offerings.
Pascale, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Oversees implementation of the International Baccalaureate Middle Years Programme. Develops and facilitates professional development and provides support for deliberate practice plans. Assists teachers in the development of common formative assessments. Provides instructional coaching to for all courses.

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 analyzes and compiles testing data over the summer and disseminates it to the curriculum leaders during pre-planning. Curriculum leaders bring the data to their PLCs and all teachers discuss and review the data. Afterwards, the leadership team chooses the greatest areas of concern to target. The School advisory Council is presented with a draft of 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))

All subject areas will utilize common assessments to monitor data. Administrators, and instructional coaches attend all PLCs to ensure curriculum aligns with the standards. Math and ELA departments will also use data from the state progress monitoring assessments to revise instruction as needed. We will review the SIP goals at our faculty meetings and with our SAC and PTSA, and share with our community through our newsletter.

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	66%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	80%
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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A
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	52	85	97	234	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	60	72	144	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	39	50	91	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	15	39	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	116	110	294	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	81	63	228	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	81	63	212	

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	65	106	109	280	

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	2	1	0	3
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	100	95	105	300	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	37	45	89	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	44	53	101	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	35	33	69	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	97	84	273	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	93	68	264	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	97	84	273	

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	97	105	110	312

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	1	1	2

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	100	95	105	300	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	37	45	89	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	44	53	101	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	35	33	69	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	97	84	273	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	93	68	264	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	97	84	273	

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	97	105	110	312

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	1	1	2

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*	53	48	49	56	49	50	59		
ELA Learning Gains				49			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32			37		
Math Achievement*	63	57	56	63	36	36	58		
Math Learning Gains				66			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			37		
Science Achievement*	58	53	49	58	55	53	58		
Social Studies Achievement*	65	64	68	72	61	58	64		
Middle School Acceleration	88	77	73	81	52	49	80		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	46	43	40	55	79	76	50		

* 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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	588
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	28	Yes	4	2
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	45			
HSP	52			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	80			

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	48			

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	30	Yes	3	1
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	46			
HSP	52			
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	47			

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	53			63			58	65	88			46
SWD	17			32			13	48			4	
ELL	24			46			24	57	76		6	46
AMI												
ASN	76			86			86	88	93		5	
BLK	35			36			39	37	76		5	
HSP	39			53			42	55	79		6	45
MUL	64			64							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	68			78			79	78	96		5	
FRL	36			47			42	48	79		6	38

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	56	49	32	63	66	56	58	72	81			55
SWD	15	28	23	30	49	42	27	29				
ELL	32	46	44	45	52	48	38	54	74			55
AMI												
ASN	80	66		87	88		90	92	84			
BLK	37	37	29	44	54	50	40	62	62			
HSP	44	45	32	52	61	56	46	60	73			50
MUL	63	40		78	77		75	80	83			
PAC												
WHT	71	56	33	78	70	57	74	87	90			
FRL	39	39	27	47	57	50	44	58	65			41

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	59	53	37	58	48	37	58	64	80			50
SWD	15	34	31	18	31	26	21	39				20
ELL	33	49	43	40	48	41	35	47	64			50
AMI												
ASN	84	77		84	63		79	90	91			
BLK	49	45	27	39	40	21	48	58	76			
HSP	46	46	35	45	39	37	44	53	67			50
MUL	78	59		70	55			83				
PAC												
WHT	71	60	44	74	58	46	69	77	86			
FRL	49	48	33	44	41	37	49	49	67			49

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	49%	45%	4%	47%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	50%	46%	4%	47%	3%
06	2023 - Spring	48%	44%	4%	47%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	52%	53%	-1%	54%	-2%
07	2023 - Spring	43%	38%	5%	48%	-5%
08	2023 - Spring	62%	58%	4%	55%	7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	55%	50%	5%	44%	11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	47%	50%	50%	47%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	45%	53%	48%	50%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	62%	61%	1%	66%	-4%

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 data component with the lowest performance was the proficiency of our students with disabilities in ELA and Math. The new standards in both subject areas made it more challenging for all of our students, but it especially impacted this subgroup. We feel that the structure of our support facilitation model last year also contributed because ESE support was provided in both subject areas as well as learning strategies by one teacher.

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

The largest drop in performance overall was 7th grade Civics proficiency. The factors that contributed to this decline were inconsistencies in instruction across the grade level.

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.

7th grade math performance has the greatest deficit compared to the state average. Our students were 5 points below the state average for proficiency at 43% compared to 48%. The critical factor that contributes to this deficit is that our students in 7th grade math are divided into 3 assessment levels. Only our lowest 50% of 7th grade students take the 7th grade assessment, while the other students are enrolled in 8th or 9th grade level math.

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

Our overall acceleration performance improved more than any other category with a ten point improvement. We streamlined the scheduling and added additional sections of Algebra workshop classes and participated in the district Algebra tutoring program through SAGA.

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

The two areas of concern that we would like to focus on in the EWS data will be the number of students with less than 90% attendance(234) and the number of students that failed ELA (91).

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

Our highest priorities for the school year are improving the performance of students with disabilities in math and reading, followed by closing the gap in reading proficiency between our black students and their white peers, and improving overall attendance.

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.

After reviewing our Cognia survey data from our students, and comparing it to our EWS data, we noticed that there was a need to work on the culture and environment, especially for our economically disadvantaged students and they reported feeling not included or supported more than our students that had the resources necessary.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The areas that we are going to target and improve revolve around the following questions: "How positive or negative is the energy at your school?" Last year, 38% of students responded favorably. Our goal will be to have at least 45% of students answer positively this year. The other targeted question we will address is, "How much does the behavior of other students hurt or help your learning?" Only 21% of our students answered favorably. Our goal is to increase the positive response to 33%.

Monitoring:

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

The school will create surveys that target these questions quarterly and meet with staff to review.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Pascale (michelle.pascale@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.)

During pre-planning, results from the survey were presented to the faculty. The teachers came to the conclusion that a Positive Behavior Intervention system will be utilized to promote positive culture school wide.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Positive behavior intervention systems have shown to work in a variety of schools to improve culture.

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.

Create surveys for students and release them through canvas.

Person Responsible: Michelle Pascale (michelle.pascale@ocps.net)

By When: 10/27/23

Create surveys for students and release them through canvas for quarter 2.

Person Responsible: Michelle Pascale (michelle.pascale@ocps.net)

By When: 12/15/2023

Learning Strategies class will focus on lessons that support positive interactions with other students.

Person Responsible: Nigel Hames (thomas.hames@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing beginning 9/3.

Weekly activities during lunches to promote positive interactions to develop a sense of belonging.

Person Responsible: Melissa Livingston-Taylor (melissa.livingston-taylor@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing beginning 9/3.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

After review state assessment data, one area of focus is FAST reading proficiency with in our Students with Disabilities subgroup. Of all tested areas and subgroups, this was our lowest performing area.

Measurable Outcome:

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

15% of Students with Disabilities scored level 3 or higher on the ELA PM3 in 2023. Our goal for the 2024 school year will be for 25% of these students to be on target.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored by reviewing district created unit assessments, by classroom walks, and by coaches and admin attending common planning. In addition, logs for support facilitation will be reviewed by admin and staffing specialist.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nigel Hames (thomas.hames@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.)

Support facilitation structure was changed to allow one ESE teacher to focus on supporting Math, and one to support in ELA.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Last year support facilitation was disjointed and teachers didn't have time to plan for support in different subject areas.

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.

Teachers will review data from state assessments to prepare for instructional groups

Person Responsible: Nigel Hames (thomas.hames@ocps.net)

By When: 8/10/2023

PLCs will be scheduled and structured to allow for teams to meet regularly to discuss data and instruction.

Person Responsible: Nigel Hames (thomas.hames@ocps.net)

By When: 8/10/2023

Support Facilitator and classroom instructor will attend district provided professional development for training in implementation of the correct model of instruction.

Person Responsible: Nigel Hames (thomas.hames@ocps.net)

By When: 9/13/2023

Trained staff will build capacity on campus to allow for all ELA teachers to become more proficient at utilizing support facilitation.

Person Responsible: Nigel Hames (thomas.hames@ocps.net)

By When: 12/15/23

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

After review state assessment data, one area of focus is FAST math proficiency within our Students with Disabilities subgroup. Of all tested areas and subgroups, this was our lowest performing area.

Measurable Outcome:

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

32% of Students with Disabilities scored level 3 or higher on the Math PM3 in 2023. Our goal for the 2024 school year will be for 41% of these students to be on target.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored by reviewing district created unit assessments, by classroom walks, and by coaches and admin attending common planning. In addition, logs for support facilitation will be reviewed by admin and staffing specialist.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Kempinger (daniel.kempinger@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.)

Support facilitation structure was changed to allow one ESE teacher to focus on supporting Math, and one to support in ELA.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Last year support facilitation was disjointed and teachers didn't have time to plan for support in different subject areas.

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.

Instructional coaches will meet with teachers to analyze last year's math data on state assessments.

Person Responsible: Mariela Rojas (mariela.rojas@ocps.net)

By When: August, 2023

PLC scheduled and attended weekly by all math teachers, instructional coaches and assessing administrator

Person Responsible: Daniel Kempinger (daniel.kempinger@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing beginning August 2023.

Support facilitation teachers will attend district training with classroom teacher to build capacity on the best practices for implementing this support.

Person Responsible: Daniel Kempinger (daniel.kempinger@ocps.net)

By When: September 18, 2023

Students will take the FAST math assessment and teachers will analyze data for deficiencies

Person Responsible: Mariela Rojas (mariela.rojas@ocps.net)

By When: September 9th, 2023

Teachers will use common assessments to monitor student progress within each unit of the course. Through PLCs, teachers will adjust instruction to meet the needs of all students

Person Responsible: Mariela Rojas (mariela.rojas@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing, beginning in august

Students will take the mid-year FAST assessment to monitor their progress for growth.

Person Responsible: Daniel Kempinger (daniel.kempinger@ocps.net)

By When: December 15, 2023

Students will be identified for additional support based upon data and an intervention schedule will be created.

Person Responsible: Daniel Kempinger (daniel.kempinger@ocps.net)

By When: October 15, 2023