

Orange County Public Schools

Gotha 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	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Gotha Middle

9155 GOTHA RD, Windermere, FL 34786

<https://gothams.ocps.net/>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Emery, Monica	Principal	Oversees Instruction (ELA, Electives, and 8th Math), Staff Handbook, Opening Day Procedures, Testing, Instructional Leadership Meetings, Discipline, Duty Posts/ Supervision, Whole School Support, Professional Learning Team, STEM, Open House, Meet Your Teacher
Coner, Chivas	Assistant Principal	Oversees Instruction (Science, Social Studies, and 7th Grade Math), Accountability/Corrections Lead, FTE/Certify, Report Cards/ Progress Reports, Master Schedule, DMC Updates, Skyward Support, SIP, Technology/ DCTL 1:1, Celebrations/Awards Ceremonies, Access and Opportunity Initiatives (Calculus Project/ PASS/Mentoring), PBIS School-wide, Rentals/Calendar Requests, Facilities/Property Manager, Textbooks
Hopkins, Christina	Assistant Principal	Oversees Custodians, Inventory, Summer School/ESY, ELL Support (McGinley Lead), ESE Support, Interventions/Tutoring, SAC Minutes/ Reporting, Emergency Drills/SAFE Schools Plan, Industry Certification/ DIT, Field Trips/ Gradventure, Fundraisers, Website, Truancy, PBIS - Classroom.
Brown, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	Math coach supporting common planning, testing coordinator
Bellamy, Katrina	Dean	8th grade discipline
Hayes, Kimberly	Dean	6th grade discipline
Taylor, Richard	Dean	7th grade discipline
McGinley, Marjorie	ELL Compliance Specialist	ELL Compliance and support
Nealy, Angela	Other	SAFE Coordinator, Title IX contact, transportation
Miller, Maureen	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach supporting ELA common planning, Cambridge Coordinator, lead mentor, journalism
Laureano, Sara	Staffing Specialist	Staffing Specialist for ESE, conducts IEP meetings, ESE support
Bonilla, Katherine	Behavior Specialist	School behavior specialist, support students with a Behavior Intervention plan, and assists with PBIS.
Soper, Christina	School Counselor	Counselor for 6th grade (students L-Z) and 8th grade, assists with student scheduling, celebrations and awards ceremonies.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Woodward, Rachel	School Counselor	Counselor for 6th grade (students A-K) and 7th grade, assists with student scheduling, celebrations and awards ceremonies.
McCluskey, Emilee	Other	Oversees PASS, support students in PBIS and restorative practice, supports all grade levels in discipline and interventions, support Civics in common planning

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.

Stakeholders, including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students, families, and community leaders, are involved in the SIP development process through the review of historical data, identification of student gaps, and providing feedback on how to support students for the 2023-2024 school year.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The School Improvement Plan will be reviewed quarterly to assure alignment with planning, professional development and classroom instruction to positively impact all students, specifically with students that fall within gaps in achievement. Throughout the year, we will review achievement data to track success and determine the appropriate changes in students supports to meet our goals.

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	73%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	81%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI

Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) 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: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	48	74	166
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	32	20	74
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	127	102	290
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	89	74	229
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	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	54	96	81	231

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	2	3	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	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							68	77	350	495
One or more suspensions							18	19	13	50
Course failure in ELA							11	5	19	35
Course failure in Math							3	4	11	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							79	70	96	245
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							91	77	100	268
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	77	70	99	246

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	68	77	97	242
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	19	13	50
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	19	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	70	96	245
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	77	100	268
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	77	70	99	246

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	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*	50	48	49	54	49	50	53		
ELA Learning Gains				51			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			38		
Math Achievement*	52	57	56	53	36	36	48		
Math Learning Gains				56			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			31		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	53	53	49	52	55	53	44		
Social Studies Achievement*	68	64	68	64	61	58	65		
Middle School Acceleration	67	77	73	76	52	49	77		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	46	43	40	43	79	76	51		

* 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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	336
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	529
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	26	Yes	4	4
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	46			
HSP	50			
MUL	48			
PAC				
WHT	74			
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	29	Yes	3	3
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	44			
HSP	51			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	45			

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			52			53	68	67			46
SWD	21			28			19	34			4	
ELL	28			35			26	56	50		6	46
AMI												
ASN	77			77			75	90	88		5	
BLK	39			39			34	60	48		6	55
HSP	41			44			51	62	54		6	48
MUL	45			50							2	
PAC												
WHT	68			70			74	76	81		5	
FRL	36			40			35	58	53		6	44

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	54	51	33	53	56	47	52	64	76			43
SWD	23	34	23	22	41	38	29	18				
ELL	37	48	39	36	50	43	30	34	62			43
AMI												
ASN	75	68		72	71		68	100	80			
BLK	39	42	30	35	48	44	34	55	67			43
HSP	47	49	43	49	54	47	46	53	74			48
MUL	55	44		45	65							
PAC												
WHT	73	61	24	74	64	48	74	78	81			
FRL	41	46	33	38	52	46	39	50	69			37

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	53	51	38	48	36	31	44	65	77			51
SWD	17	34	25	21	32	30	14	40				
ELL	24	40	41	25	32	34	11	43	62			51

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
AMI												
ASN	80	61		76	55		88	70	89			
BLK	38	44	35	30	29	26	29	55	57			44
HSP	47	51	45	45	36	36	29	61	68			43
MUL	52	57		50	33		58					
PAC	40	60		40	0							
WHT	71	56	35	67	42	34	60	79	89			
FRL	40	47	38	33	30	24	34	50	72			48

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	51%	45%	6%	47%	4%
08	2023 - Spring	46%	46%	0%	47%	-1%
06	2023 - Spring	43%	44%	-1%	47%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	48%	53%	-5%	54%	-6%
07	2023 - Spring	29%	38%	-9%	48%	-19%
08	2023 - Spring	53%	58%	-5%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	51%	50%	1%	44%	7%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	47%	26%	50%	23%

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	64%	61%	3%	66%	-2%

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 is ELA with an overall proficiency of 47%. BEST standards and FAST testing was adopted statewide during the 2022-2023 school-year. Although the standards and assessments differ from the prior year, an emphasis on scaffolding and literacy across the content areas during common planning would have positively impacted student achievement in ELA. Furthermore, due to a decrease in student enrollment, ELA teachers taught multiple grade levels, causing strain on PLCs and monitoring which may have been a contributing factor to low performance in this area.

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

The data component with the greatest decline from the prior year is ELA with decrease of 7 points between 2022 to 2023. BEST standards and FAST testing was adopted statewide during the 2022-2023 school-year. Although the standards and testing differ from the prior year, an emphasis on differentiation and scaffolding and literacy across the content areas during common planning would have positively impacted student achievement in ELA. Furthermore, due to a decrease in student enrollment, ELA teachers taught multiple grade levels, which was a contributing factor to low performance in this area.

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.

Overall state data for ELA has not been released, however, the greatest gap compared to district data is ELA achievement. Our ELA achievement compared to the district is a 9 point gap. 6th grade showed the

biggest need with 4 point gap compared to the state. The factors contributing to this gap is support for our SWD students and ability to properly differentiate and scaffold instruction to meet their needs. Furthermore, using data to plan for reteach was inconsistent school-wide.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Middle School Acceleration which increased by 3 points from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023. The actions the school took in this area was appropriately placing students in acceleration courses (Algebra 1 and Geometry) based on achievement and implementing Digital Info Tech (DIT) as a course option for students to earn an industry certification for students that did not want to take Algebra 1 or Geometry.

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

Based on early warning systems data, areas of concern include students with 1 or more suspensions, math failures and students that scored a level 1 on the ELA assessment. From 2021-2022 to 2022-23, students with 1 or more suspensions increased by 24 students, Math failures increased by 8 students, and students that scored a Level 1 in ELA achievement increased by 45 students. Please note, ELA and Math standards changed in 2022-2023 and is considered a baseline year.

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

The highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year is a focus of literacy across content areas to increase proficiency for ELA, Civics and Science achievement. Another priority is addressing high absenteeism and engagement through Positive Behavior Intervention Systems with students identified with two or more early warning indicators, as well as provide scaffolding and interventions for students in lowest 30 percent.

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 area of focus is creating a positive culture and environment for students identified by EWS. Based on early warning systems data, areas of concern include students with 1 or more suspensions, math failures and students that scored a level 1 on the ELA assessment. From 2021-2022 to 2022-23, students with 1 or more suspensions increased by 24 students, Math failures increased by 8 students, and students that scored a Level 1 in ELA achievement increased by 45 students. Please note, ELA and Math standards changed in 2022-2023 and is considered a baseline year. By decreasing suspensions, students will receive more Tier 1 instruction to positively impact ELA and Math achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

This area of focus will be monitoring by using Early Warning Systems to reduce suspensions, increase ELA and Math achievement, increase restorative practices, and increase positive relationships.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus, including student suspensions and Math and ELA Achievement, will be progress monitored quarterly by school administrators to make adjustments to the PBIS system based on the data reviewed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Emery (monica.emery@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention being implemented is a school-wide Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS) aligned to the Cambridge Attributes (Confident, Engaged, Innovative, Reflective, and Responsible).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this strategy is the PBIS system is to provide a culture of accountability for all students. School-wide, students are encouraged to adhere to the Cambridge Attributes to encourage achievement for all students. Furthermore, students identified with two or more early warning indicators will be targeted for mentoring.

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.

Implement committee to oversee PBIS and Cambridge initiatives

Person Responsible: Monica Emery (monica.emery@ocps.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Create and roll-out schoolwide token economy aligned to Cambridge attributes

Person Responsible: Christina Hopkins (christina.hopkins@ocps.net)

By When: September 4, 2023

Monitor restorative practices through student mentoring and PASS

Person Responsible: Chivas Coner (chivas.coner@ocps.net)

By When: From August 10, 2023 throughout the year

#2. 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.

An area of focus is instructional practice related to ELA. The data component with the greatest decline from the prior year is ELA with decrease of 7 points between 2022 to 2023. By focusing on integrating literacy across the other content areas, the school can increase proficiency in ELA, Civics, and Science.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The outcomes will be measured by reviewing FAST ELA data, with the third assessment reaching an overall proficiency of 55% and increase ELA proficiency for SWD by 10% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by assuring that a literacy coach and school administrators are involved PLCs to provide literacy strategies and assuring alignment of standards and classroom instruction. Classroom walkthroughs will be conducted by the leadership team to monitoring the implementation of those strategies in instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Emery (monica.emery@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.)

This evidence-based intervention being implemented for this area of focus will be common planning with an emphasis on literacy to increase student achievement for ELA and other content areas

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this strategy is that by increasing literacy support in PLCs aligned with monitoring instructional implementation by admin, student proficiencies will increase for ELA, Civics, and Science. Alignment of planning, classroom instruction, and monitoring will ensure student growth.

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.

Support ELA PLCs and common planning meetings for all grade levels

Person Responsible: Monica Emery (monica.emery@ocps.net)

By When: 2023-2024 weekly

Support common planning school-wide to increase literacy across content areas

Person Responsible: Maureen Miller (maureen.miller@ocps.net)

By When: 2023-2024 weekly

Alignment of walk-through tool with common planning look-for's

Person Responsible: Monica Emery (monica.emery@ocps.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Instruction rounds (walk-throughs) to ensure alignment of planning and instruction.

Person Responsible: Monica Emery (monica.emery@ocps.net)

By When: 2023-2024 weekly

Bi-weekly coach meetings to tier teachers and review trends.

Person Responsible: Monica Emery (monica.emery@ocps.net)

By When: 2023-2024 bi-weekly

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).

The process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated our SWD subgroup is to present the data comparison of ESSA data for 2022-2023 and 2023-2024, identify areas of improvement with the plan to address needs. School-wide we are focusing on the implementation of a Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS) and providing more professional development for teachers on effective strategies for differentiation and scaffolding in classroom instruction. Resources and costs to address needs will presented to and voted on by the School Advisory Committee (SAC). Our Florida School Recognition fund totals \$7,449.77 and our School Improvement fund totals \$3,794.61. Those funds will be prioritized to support the SWD subgroup