

Orange County Public Schools

# Maitland Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Maitland Middle

701 N THISTLE LN, Maitland, FL 32751

<https://maitlandms.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 to lead our students to success.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To ensure every student has a promising a 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
Brown, Askimelik	Principal	Oversees all aspects of the school and communicates with all stakeholders to ensure shared decision making. Oversees Assistant Principals, Resource teachers, selected Classified Staff, Social Studies Dept, Science Dept, and Fine Arts Dept.
Pavlonnis, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	Assistant principal over instruction. Oversees scheduling and instruction. Supervises the English Language Arts, Exceptional Student Education, and Physical Education Departments. Maintains data tracking and coaches teachers with instructional practices.
Thompson, Vaughnsha	Assistant Principal	Assistant principal over discipline and facilities. Oversees all discipline matters and ensures policies and procedures are followed. Is responsible for the maintenance of facilities and submitting repair requests. Supervises the Math and Business Departments. Maintains data tracking and coaches teachers with instructional practices.
Orseno, Amy	Instructional Coach	Oversees new teachers and induction initiatives. Develops and facilitates professional development and provides support for deliberate practice plans. Assists teachers in the development of common to for math and science courses.
Wood, Lauren	Dean	Monitors discipline data by subgroups and frequency. Assist with administration with school safety procedures. Serves as a member of threat assessment team and supports with administration in developing and monitoring Positive Behavior Intervention Systems.
Himschoot, Brian	Dean	Administrative discipline dean that oversees referral and discipline infractions process. Monitors discipline data by subgroups and frequency. Coordinates with administration operations, facilities, and school safety procedures. Serves as a member of threat assessment team and supports the PASS classroom as needed Coordinates with administration in developing and monitoring the effectiveness of mentoring programs.
John, Tricia	Staffing Specialist	ESE Compliance and Support

**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.

Mr. Brown will seek input from all stakeholders to develop a comprehensive plan that will increase student achievement. Leadership team will meet on a weekly basis. All other stakeholders will receive information or updates monthly.

**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))

Our School Improvement Plan will be monitored regularly by conducting classroom walkthroughs, Standard Based Unit Assessments, Progress Monitoring Assessments, and Panorama Surveys.

**Demographic Data**  
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	55%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	50%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	37	50	58	145
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	64	47	116
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	14	31
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	72	79	189
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	56	29	132
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	39	73	62	174

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	1	1	2

**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	50	13	5	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	32	56
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	13	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	51	63	152
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	23	34	104
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	39	52	79	170

**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	3	4

**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								50	13	5	68
One or more suspensions									24	32	56
Course failure in ELA								4	1	2	7
Course failure in Math								1	8	13	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment								38	51	63	152
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment								47	23	34	104
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.								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	39	52	79	170

**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	3	4

**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*	50	48	49	58	49	50	63		
ELA Learning Gains				45			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			36		
Math Achievement*	63	57	56	61	36	36	63		
Math Learning Gains				55			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			33		
Science Achievement*	50	53	49	63	55	53	58		
Social Studies Achievement*	69	64	68	77	61	58	78		
Middle School Acceleration	85	77	73	81	52	49	86		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	38	43	40	33	79	76	17		

\* 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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	355
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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	551
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	23	Yes	4	4
ELL	36	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	27	Yes	2	2
HSP	52			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	44			

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	31	Yes	3	3
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	49			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	41			

**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	50			63			50	69	85			38
SWD	12			30			19	30			4	
ELL	23			43			28	47			5	38
AMI												
ASN	76			100			73		93		4	
BLK	24			33			11	39			4	
HSP	45			55			30	67	71		6	42
MUL	56			65			65		85		4	
PAC												
WHT	61			78			69	79	87		5	
FRL	34			45			25	51	72		6	39

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	58	45	34	61	55	44	63	77	81			33
SWD	19	31	32	24	39	32	25	44				
ELL	33	30	23	37	55	50	38	45				33
AMI												
ASN	81	57		90	86			100				
BLK	21	36	33	19	37	33	26	41				
HSP	51	40	30	49	53	48	52	61	75			31
MUL	64	44		61	50			88				
PAC												
WHT	69	49	39	75	59	54	78	91	84			
FRL	36	35	29	36	47	41	43	55	72			18

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	63	53	36	63	43	33	58	78	86			17
SWD	13	31	27	16	24	22	14	47				
ELL	41	61	57	39	36	19	36	53				17
AMI												
ASN	85	65		92	50				91			
BLK	26	29	21	21	28	25	31	46	61			
HSP	54	50	40	48	36	26	45	67	83			12
MUL	74	61		68	35							
PAC												
WHT	76	62	52	80	51	56	72	92	90			
FRL	40	41	31	37	32	27	36	59	74			7

**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	45%	46%	-1%	47%	-2%
06	2023 - Spring	49%	44%	5%	47%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	59%	53%	6%	54%	5%
07	2023 - Spring	37%	38%	-1%	48%	-11%
08	2023 - Spring	58%	58%	0%	55%	3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	48%	50%	-2%	44%	4%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	47%	43%	50%	40%

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

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	63%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	61%	6%	66%	1%

### 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 has had a steady decline throughout the years. 2020-21 ELA proficiency was 63%, 2021-22 proficiency was at 58%. This is a 5% decrease throughout the years. One contributing factor is the lack of student engagement in the classroom.

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

ELA has had a steady decline throughout the years. 2020-21 ELA proficiency was 63%, 2021-22 proficiency was at 58%. This is a 5% decrease throughout the years. One contributing factor is the lack of student engagement in the classroom.

**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.**

There is a gap between the state and MMS with student with disabilities. The state average of proficiency is 28% and MMS proficiency is 24%. A contributing factor is that students with disabilities need to see lessons with a variety of teaching styles and multiple exposure to the standards and skills. Instructional practices didn't include consistent hands on engaging activities.

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

Math demonstrated the most improvement in proficiency from 61% to 66%. Teachers utilized the standards based unit assessment data and the 2nd PMA data to develop plans of actions to be more intentional with instruction and reteach. This year we have decided to implement Pre-AP Algebra 1 Honors to help enhance student learning. We will utilize the additional resources to help support student achievement.

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

One area of concern is student attendance 145 students have 10% or more absences throughout the year. This is 19% of our students who have been absent 10% of the time.

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

Increase overall ELA proficiency 18%  
 Increase overall Math proficiency 3%  
 Increase the amount of ELL students proficiency in ELA and Math by 10%  
 Increase the amount of ESE students proficiency in ELA and Math by 10%  
 Decrease the number of students that have 10% of more absences by 10%

#### 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.

Implementing a school-wide Positive Behavior Intervention System that includes students and teachers will hopefully increase a positive school culture and maximize instructional time. 2022-23 year 180 students were suspended and 77% were black students.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

During the 2022-23 school we had 180 students suspended and 77% were black students. The 2023-24 school year we are focusing on PBIS schoolwide initiative and will decrease our suspension rate by 10%.

**Monitoring:**

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

We will monitor through schoolwide PBIS implementation by utilizing HERO system to give points and reinforce positive behaviors throughout the school. Students can purchase items from our HERO store biweekly and/or save their points for larger reinforcers. We will monitor students HERO points every 4.5 weeks.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Brian Himschoot (brian.himschoot@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.)

Schoolwide PBIS incentive plan has been implemented. The students have ways to earn positive HERO points and shop in the school store.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

National Education Association states that using a PBIS plan sees improvements of behavior overall

**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.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Maitland Middle School reported 54% proficient in ELA for the 2022-23 school year

### Measurable Outcome:

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

The total proficiency level for ELA - PM 3 was 47% proficient. it is our focus to increase proficiency 55%  
ESSA Group SWD- PMA 3 was 19% it is our focus to increase proficiency to 24%  
ESSA Group Black Students- PMA 3 was 30% it is our focus to increase proficiency to 35%  
ESSA Group ELL- PMA 3 was 23% it is our focus to increase proficiency to 28%

The total proficiency level for Math - PM 3 was 62% proficient. it is our focus to increase proficiency 70%  
ESSA Group SWD- PMA 3 was 19 % proficient. It is our focus to increase proficiency to 24%  
ESSA Group Black Students- PMA 3 was 35% proficient. It is our focus to increase proficiency to 40%.  
ESSA Group ELL- PMA 3 was 33% proficient.. It is our focus to increase proficiency to 38%.

### Monitoring:

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

We will monitor students unit assessments, conduct instructional walks, and analyze PM data to track student progress.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vaughnsha Thompson (vaughnsha.thompson@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.)

Utilization of Kagan strategies will increase student engagement therefore student achievement will increase. Teachers will focus on content vocabulary throughout units of study to increase literacy

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Robert Marzano and John Hattie both agree that getting students to work with each other helps them to achieve better results. The use of cooperative learning groups adds value to whole-class instruction ( $d = 0.41$ ) and to individual work ( $d = 0.59-0.78$ ).

### 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.

Schoolwide Kagan training

**Person Responsible:** Amy Orseno (amy.orseno@ocps.net)

**By When:** August 7, 2023

Monthly ELA classroom instructional walks

**Person Responsible:** Kimberly Pavlonnis (kimberly.pavlonnis@ocps.net)

**By When:** Monthly through the end of the school year

Monthly Math classroom instructional walks

**Person Responsible:** Vaughnsha Thompson (vaughnsha.thompson@ocps.net)

**By When:** Monthly through the end of the school year

PMA, Standard Based Unit Assessments, Progress Monitoring, STAR Data chats

**Person Responsible:** AskiMelik Brown (askimelik.brown@ocps.net)

**By When:** Monthly through the end of the year

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**

**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.

2022-2-23 school year 19% of students fell into the 10% or more category for absences.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

MMS will decrease the number of absences by parent phone calls, Social Worker visits, and truancy meetings. We will decrease from 19% to 10% of students falling into the 10% or more absence category

**Monitoring:**

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

Monthly attendance meetings

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kimberly Pavlonnis (kimberly.pavlonnis@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.)

Student conferences, phone calls home, attendance contracts, social worker visits, and meetings. We will also give students a mentor that will meet with them once a week and offer incentives to improve attendance.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order for proficiency to improve students must attend school consistently.

**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.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**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/school administration examines instructional allocations and instructional support staffing. Necessary decision making is completed within designated time frames to support student needs and

appropriate learning as supported by all funding measures, specifically relating to ESSA subgroups. Provision of substitutes is also analyzed to ensure that appropriate personnel are attending trainings to outlined support areas of focus, teacher development through professional learning.