

Orange County Public Schools

# Chain Of Lakes 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>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>24</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>

## Chain Of Lakes Middle

8700 CONROY WINDERMERE RD, Orlando, FL 32835

<https://chainoflakesms.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.**

Our Mission: With the support of families and the community, create enriching and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

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

Our Vision: 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
Walker, Robert	Principal	Oversee all school operations. Directly supervise electives, operational teams (Behavior, Student Services, Curriculum & Instruction), and Assistant Principals.
Harbin, Charles	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Instruction. Oversees scheduling, FTE compliance, school counselors, testing, ESE, and ELL compliance. Directly supervises social studies and math departments.
Davila, Tonishia	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Operations oversees custodial crew, all asset inventory, behavior team, and directly supervises reading, science, and English departments.
Correa, Allison	Dean	Academic dean oversees our MTSS program through our behavior team, student services team, and curriculum & instruction team. Responsible for monthly math data chats.
Thompson, Jomane	Instructional Coach	Instructional coach is responsible for new teacher mentoring, data chats with civics and 8th grade science and serves on the curriculum & instruction team.
Alexander, Julie	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Mrs. Alexander serves as a direct support to our ELA department. This includes supporting the work of ELA PLCs, providing coaching (including co-teaching), leading professional development sessions for both ELA and campus-wide, and engaging ELA PLCs in data chats and leading the process of planning for intervention based on the data.
Moncur, Patricia	Staffing Specialist	Mrs. Moncur works to maintain compliance with all IEP plans, this includes conducting initial eligibility and annual reviews. She also serves as a primary point of contact for the parents of our ESE students.

### 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.

Parent and student stakeholder groups were involved through a community meeting as well as direct meeting with PTSA board members. Faculty and staff input was gained through pre-planning discussion.

**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))

Progress toward areas of focus on the SIP will be monitored as part of the monthly data chats within the relevant departments. The school leadership team will review this data as part of the Curriculum & Instruction Team's work. That team will propose revisions to the SIP as appropriate. Proposed changes will be shared with stakeholder groups prior to being instituted.

**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>	84%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	89%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<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) Pacific Islander Students (PAC)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
<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	83	126	142	351	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	104	90	225	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	18	42	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	17	36	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	133	214	198	545	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	175	129	438	
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	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	125	211	187	523	

**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	1	0	0	1
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	114	129	149	392	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	69	84	172	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	15	6	36	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	3	19	39	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	138	163	446	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	174	131	158	463	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	138	163	446	

**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	147	152	186	485

**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	4	5

**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	114	129	149	392	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	69	84	172	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	15	6	36	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	3	19	39	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	138	163	446	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	174	131	158	463	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	138	163	446	

**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	147	152	186	485

**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	4	5

**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*	36	48	49	37	49	50	40		
ELA Learning Gains				44			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			44		
Math Achievement*	36	57	56	42	36	36	42		
Math Learning Gains				47			34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			31		
Science Achievement*	41	53	49	40	55	53	37		
Social Studies Achievement*	46	64	68	54	61	58	42		
Middle School Acceleration	55	77	73	67	52	49	60		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	47	43	40	39	79	76	45		

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

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

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	261
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96
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	13	Yes	4	2
ELL	37	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	34	Yes	2	
HSP	44			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	40	Yes	2	

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	24	Yes	3	1
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	68			
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	45			
MUL	54			
PAC	29	Yes	1	1
WHT	53			
FRL	38	Yes	1	

### Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	36			36			41	46	55			47
SWD	8			11			8	23			4	
ELL	27			31			30	37	48		6	47
AMI												
ASN	76			68			92		69		4	
BLK	24			25			27	36	52		6	38
HSP	38			37			46	44	52		6	48
MUL	56			56			54	69	64		5	
PAC												
WHT	53			54			61	61	55		6	36
FRL	30			29			36	40	57		6	50

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	37	44	34	42	47	41	40	54	67			39
SWD	11	34	32	17	34	33	4	30				
ELL	25	41	33	30	40	36	22	41	58			39
AMI												
ASN	71	47		83	63			73	70			
BLK	30	43	33	31	42	39	31	49	65			8
HSP	39	44	34	43	49	43	38	54	66			42
MUL	54	48		63	52			54				
PAC	18			40								
WHT	46	46	23	57	49	43	67	68	74			
FRL	31	40	33	32	42	37	31	46	64			21

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	40	43	44	42	34	31	37	42	60			45
SWD	8	26	34	17	27	23	18	11				
ELL	20	48	54	29	37	35	17	20	42			45
AMI												
ASN	81	80		85	46		60		69			
BLK	31	35	33	27	27	28	22	32	44			38
HSP	38	45	52	44	37	34	38	41	59			45
MUL	68	48		54	40							
PAC												
WHT	57	51	45	66	46	38	57	68	82			47
FRL	35	38	36	33	28	27	29	33	57			43

### 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	25%	45%	-20%	47%	-22%
08	2023 - Spring	33%	46%	-13%	47%	-14%
06	2023 - Spring	28%	44%	-16%	47%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	30%	53%	-23%	54%	-24%
07	2023 - Spring	17%	38%	-21%	48%	-31%
08	2023 - Spring	37%	58%	-21%	55%	-18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	36%	50%	-14%	44%	-8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	47%	24%	50%	21%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	45%	35%	48%	32%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	38%	61%	-23%	66%	-28%

### 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.**

Reading achievement showed the lowest performance at 29% school-wide, 7th grade was the lowest at 25%. For 2022-23 the ELA department was comprised of nearly all first year teachers, with two veteran exceptions. In addition to the lack of instructional experience, reading proficiency has been trending downward over the course of the last several school years.

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

Civics scores represented the largest decline, going from 54% in 2021-22 to 38% in 2022-23. The civics team for 2022-23 was comprised of all first year teachers.

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

The largest gap was in reading. While roughly 47% of Florida middle schoolers were proficient, only 29% of Chain of Lakes students were. One factor likely contributing to this gap is the overall level of inexperience within our ELA department during the 2022-23 school year, 60% of the department was in their first year teaching. Our new CRT, Mrs. Alexander, was added to the staff to address this specific factor. The decline in proficiency follows a multi-year trend of declining reading proficiency.

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

The school's acceleration score improved from 67% to 75%. The school was very deliberate in reviewing student course placement and ensuring accurate scheduling.

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

Two biggest areas of concerns from the EWS are the number of students with attendance concerns and the number of students scoring a level 1 in both reading and math.

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

The first priority has to be supporting and improving reading instruction. That is followed by math instruction school-wide, and then specific work with our ELL and SWD subgroups.

#### **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.

The members of the leadership team at Chain of Lakes Middle School seek to restore positive relationships with faculty and staff members, students, families, and community partners. Data analysis of our most recent Panorama surveys showed the most significant declines in school safety (a 20 point decline for parents, 63% to 43% and 5 points for students, 41% to 36%), rigorous expectations (a 7 point decline from 52% favorable to 45%), and teacher/student relationships (a 10 point decline from 48% favorable to 38%).

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The goal of this focus is to improve the overall student ratings on school safety by 5 points, from 36% to 41%, an increase of having rigorous expectations from 45% to 50%, and improve relations between teachers and students from 38% to 43%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Student feedback will be collected in formal and informal settings by members of the leadership team. The spring and fall Panorama surveys will provide quantitative data points on the goals highlighted above.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Robert Walker (robert.walker5@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.)

We will continue with the emphasis of intentionally building sustainable relationships in the classroom and with our school community. This will be coupled with Restorative Practices, PBIS and Osprey bucks initiatives.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that students who feel that they are being held to rigorous expectations around effort and understanding by their teachers are more likely to trust that their teachers believe in them and their capacity to succeed, and as a result, achieve greater academic success.

**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.

Develop a system for consistent use of Osprey Bucks to incentivize behavior that contributes to a positive school climate.

**Person Responsible:** Allison Correa (58875@ocps.net)

**By When:** This will be done throughout the school year.

Develop a system where teachers are able to write positive referrals for students contributing to a positive classroom and school environment.

**Person Responsible:** Allison Correa (58875@ocps.net)

**By When:** This will be done throughout the school year.

Professional development will be done on restorative practices and teachers interested in being district-trained will be provided with the opportunity Minority Achievement Office.

**Person Responsible:** Robert Walker (robert.walker5@ocps.net)

**By When:** Semester 1

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners****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.

ELL students constitute a sizable portion of the school's enrollment, 24%, and their performance has fallen well below their peers, for multiple years. For 2022-23, ELL students had a reading achievement of 17%, 12% below the school average which is at 29%. One area of focus is to provide rigorous standards-based and explicit instruction for ELL students with an emphasis on literacy skills. Research indicates that the literacy demands on students increase in complexity as they move through middle school into high school and post-secondary education as well as the workforce. An emphasis on literacy skills will help ELL students be successful with rigorous standards-based instruction across all content areas.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The goal is to improve ELL performance in all areas by 10 or more points. This would increase reading achievement from 17% to 27%,

**Monitoring:**

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

Progress monitoring with FAST and PMA data, Observation data from classroom walkthroughs, and Common assessment data will be used to monitor our progress toward this goal.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Allison Correa (58875@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.)

Use distributive leadership to implement a continuous improvement plan of support for our English language learners, intentionally integrating best practices in instructional strategies by using explicit instruction and utilizing the RACE strategy to help students to well-developed constructed responses to literacy. RACE: Restate, Answer, Cite Evidence. The strategy makes it easy to remember everything a teacher wants when answering reading response questions. We will focus on collaborative planning and problem-solving to identify needs and supports.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Administrators and resource personnel will regularly review student performance data to look for evidence of an increase in ELL student achievement in literacy skills using data from common assessments, writing prompts, and FAST. Through the distributive leadership model, our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the academic development of ELL students. Our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school by actively engaging teachers by regularly soliciting teacher feedback, observing teachers in the classroom, and guiding teachers to reflect upon their practice; Routinely evaluate student data to track progress in meeting student achievement goals. In addition, evidence of teacher implementation of the RACE literacy strategy and differentiated instruction will be collected from classroom walkthroughs. These data points will be analyzed at weekly administrative / resource personnel meetings to determine necessary adjustments to our professional development and teacher support.

### **Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 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.

ELL Compliance Specialist, Mrs. Leite will work closely with Academic Dean, Mrs. Correa, to provide teachers with both information identifying ELL students as well as professional development focused on providing instruction to ELL students.

**Person Responsible:** Allison Correa (58875@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing process throughout the school year.

Compile data tracking sheets for all ELLs to support progress monitoring (admins, counselors, and ELL compliance review after each data point to discuss additional supports and interventions).

**Person Responsible:** Allison Correa (58875@ocps.net)

**By When:** After common assessments and PMAs

The curriculum and Instruction team engages in regular walkthroughs to identify strengths, trends, and growth opportunities for best practices in instruction. Regularly monitor achievement data. Meet weekly to engage in a continuous improvement cycle.

**Person Responsible:** Jomane Thompson (jomane.thompson@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing process throughout the school year.

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Improving reading achievement school-wide. When reviewing data trends, reading proficiency declined from 40% to 37% from 2020-21 to 2021-22, the final year of FSA testing. For 2022-23, the first year of FAST testing, reading proficiency further declined to 29%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The measurable outcome will be improving school-wide reading achievement by 10 points, from 29% to 39%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Progress in this area of focus will be monitored using a combination of common assessment data from reading and ELA classes, Standards Based Unit Assessment (SBUA) scores, and FAST assessment data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

To support this area of focus we will use multiple strategies. We have added a curriculum resource teacher, CRT, who is focused on supporting instruction in ELA. We will also support through ELA professional learning communities, hold monthly data chats with ELA, engage level 1 readers in targeted support through reading instruction, and provide additional support to instruction through partnership with district program specialists. Reading classes will employ a rotational instructional model to support student acquisition of skills and closing of gaps.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies were selected by examining available resources, needs, and high-yield strategies. Supporting both instruction through PLCs as well as data chats will guide those teachers in both their use of high-yield instructional strategies as well as ensuring their work is grounded in student performance data.

**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.

Assistant Principal, Dr. Davila, will meet weekly with reading department PLC and 8th grade ELA. CRT, Mrs. Alexander, will provide support to 6th and 7th grade ELA PLCs. Dr. Davila will partner district resource personnel to support ELA & reading.

**Person Responsible:** Tonishia Davila (tonishia.davila@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the year.

Dr. Davila will engage the reading department and 8th grade ELA in data chats to include both overall data trends as well as subgroup trends on a monthly basis. CRT, Mrs. Alexander, will oversee chats for 6th and 7th grade ELA.

**Person Responsible:** Julie Alexander (103271@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing, monthly

Dr. Davila & Dr. Walker will conduct instructional observations in conjunction with our Curriculum & Instruction Team, they will identify teachers in these departments in need of additional coaching and support.

**Person Responsible:** Robert Walker (robert.walker5@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing

CRT, Mrs. Alexander, will provide coaching and support to teachers in these departments as identified by the Curriculum & Instruction Team. This will include co-teaching based on need identified by the curriculum and instruction team.

**Person Responsible:** Julie Alexander (103271@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing.

**#4. 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.

2023 subgroup data shows SWD students at Chain of Lakes performing drastically below their peers. SWD students had the lowest achievement in all school grade component areas, including 9% achievement in reading.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The target outcome here is to improve SWD performance by 7 points in both reading in math. This would be an increase from 9% to 16% in reading and 14% to 21% in math.

**Monitoring:**

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

Progress toward the above identified goals will be monitored using triangulation of SBUA data, FAST progress monitoring, and common assessment data

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Charles Harbin (charles.harbin@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.)

Use distributive leadership to implement a continuous improvement plan of support for our students with disabilities, intentionally integrating best practices in instructional strategies and focusing on collaborative planning and problem solving to identify needs and supports.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model, our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the academic development of all students.

**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 administration team uses data and input from teachers, counselors and the staffing specialist to create a master schedule that supports equity and meets needs of all students.

**Person Responsible:** Charles Harbin (charles.harbin@ocps.net)

**By When:** August



Compile data tracking sheets for all SWD to support progress monitoring (admins, counselors, and support facilitation teachers review after each data point to discuss additional supports and interventions).

**Person Responsible:** Charles Harbin (charles.harbin@ocps.net)

**By When:** End of August

Ongoing support of ELA and reading for alignment of instruction and assessment - and ongoing support for intentional planning to increase effectiveness of support facilitation (Quarterly Planning day w/ collaboration between ELA and Support Facilitation).

**Person Responsible:** Tonishia Davila (tonishia.davila@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout school year.

Curriculum and Instruction team engage in regular walkthroughs to identify strengths, trends and growth opportunities for best practices in instruction. Regularly monitor achievement data. Meet weekly to engage in continuous improvement cycle.

**Person Responsible:** Robert Walker (robert.walker5@ocps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the school year.

Staffing specialist, Mrs. Moncur, will provide professional learning regarding best practice for implementing ESE accommodations and documenting these accommodations.

**Person Responsible:** Patricia Moncur (103917@ocps.net)

**By When:** August, Pre-Planning

Staffing specialist, Mrs. Moncur, will provide direct support to classroom teachers on best practices for supporting ESE students in their classes.

**Person Responsible:** Patricia Moncur (103917@ocps.net)

**By When:**

### 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).

Resource allocation decisions are always made by first engaging in a review of school-wide data to identify areas of need and trends in the data. This allows for focusing resources on specific needs which in turn allows for tracking of resource impact on the area of need.

In 2022-23 our ELA department was composed of 60% first-year teachers and coupled with a lack of dedicated coaching support. While there had previously been a literacy coach supporting ELA & reading, that position was eliminated due to budgetary constraints. For 2023-24 a CRT, Mrs. Alexander, has been added to the leadership team to work specifically with ELA. SBUA data along assessments of instructional growth captured using our walk through tool will be used to monitor the impact of Mrs. Alexander's work with the department throughout the year. This will also include reviews of co-teaching cycle effectiveness at intervals identified specifically for each coaching cycle. Cycles will be tailored to the individual teacher need.

Budgetary constraints for 2022-23 and 2023-24 prevented the addition of a dedicated math coach to support instruction in that content area; however, for 2023-24 intensive math courses have been brought back to our courses offerings to provide that direct intervention to identified students in math. Additionally, a teacher with



math coaching experience has been added to the department to teach intensive math. While providing direct intervention to our 6th graders with math content gaps in need of closing, his data literacy and experience coaching instruction will be beneficial in growing instruction within the department. Additionally, partnership with district math experts and our assistant principal overseeing mathematics, Mr. Charles Harbin, will be developed to enhance his ability to support improvements in our math instruction. Again, our walk through tool and daily walk plan, which will be reviewed and updated monthly, will be used to monitor impacts on instruction. SBUA data in conjunction with FAST PM data and PMA data for Algebra and Geometry will be used to monitor impacts on student learning throughout the school year.