Odyssey Middle School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Odyssey Middle

9290 LEE VISTA BLVD, Orlando, FL 32829

https://odysseyms.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
Smith, Beatriz	Principal	Ms. Beatriz B. Smith - Principal; Responsible for overseeing curriculum and instruction, data analysis to ensure student achievement increases, and managing the learning environment.
Rumph, Barbara	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Rumph- Assistant Principal; Creates a master schedule that allows focus on student instruction to meet the needs of all students, oversees PLCs, shares research-based practices with teachers through ongoing instructional leadership methodologies, and assists principal in curriculum and instruction, and data analysis.
Grant, Gina	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal; Monitors MTSS, and oversees the Discipline department, School Operations and Social Media. Develops and implements the teacher induction program, and shares research-based practices with teachers through ongoing instructional leadership methodologies, and assists principal in curriculum and instruction, and data analysis.
Stanley, Lori	Dean	6th/7th Grade Dean; Maintains a safe and orderly environment for students facilitates restorative justice practices and fosters positive relationships with students, faculty, and parents.
Kitts, Natalie	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Natalie Kitts - Instructional Coach/Testing Coordinator; Works with teachers to improve instruction and uses research-based strategies during instructional planning to obtain the maximum results possible in regards to student achievement.
Vijayakumar, Hema	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Ms. Vijayakumar - ECS/MTSS Coach; Assists teachers with interventions for the MTSS process. ESOL CT; Responsible for ESOL compliance concerns which includes testing students for the ESOL program and monitoring their progress. Provides ELL strategies to teachers as needed.

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.

There are different ways stakeholders contribute to the SIP:
1, Results of the Panorama survey are used to create goals for the Area of Positive Culture and

Environment
2. SIP goals are shared during teacher and staff meeting when data and SIP goals from the previous
school year are reviewed
3. IEPs and 504 plans' data are considered when creating goals for the SWD subgroup

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))

As a school community, we will revise the SIP goals established for the 2023-2024 SY by:
1. Analyze, interpret, and use data from state-mandated assessments to drive instruction and focus on
student achievement.
2. Review SIP goals during checkpoints throughout the year, facilitating reflection and implementing
intervention when necessary.
3. SIP is shared with SAC members beginning and middle of the school year

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	83%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	87%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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: B

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	32	48	44	124
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	31	23	56
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	60	56	177
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	48	37	144
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	60	56	177

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	46	53	40	139

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	58	27	53	138
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	22	43
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	18	37
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	44	76	159
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	58	63	163
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	44	76	159

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	35	44	76	155

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	0	1

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	58	27	53	138
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	22	43
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	18	37
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	44	76	159
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	58	63	163
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	44	76	159

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	35	44	76	155

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
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	0	1

The header row for the grade levels reads "Grade Level" spanning K–8.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	56	48	49	49	49	50	54		
ELA Learning Gains				48			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			34		
Math Achievement*	58	57	56	52	36	36	52		
Math Learning Gains				51			41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			41		
Science Achievement*	57	53	49	55	55	53	49		
Social Studies Achievement*	71	64	68	79	61	58	64		
Middle School Acceleration	76	77	73	78	52	49	72		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	53	43	40	53	79	76	43		

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	371
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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	544
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	4	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	61			
HSP	59			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	75			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	56			

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	3
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	50			
HSP	53			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	47			

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	56			58			57	71	76			53
SWD	19			32			43	43	60		5	
ELL	39			52			40	61	80		6	53
AMI												
ASN	71			83			71	83	79		5	
BLK	55			47			54	65	82		5	
HSP	51			54			52	65	73		6	58
MUL	54			69							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	68			72			71	85	78		5	
FRL	50			50			49	68	68		6	48

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	49	48	39	52	51	40	55	79	78			53
SWD	16	29	24	16	25	17	19	45				
ELL	32	42	46	34	36	34	46	65	76			53
AMI												
ASN	67	67		74	62		71	86	94			
BLK	43	49	38	41	45	53	52	77	53			
HSP	47	46	40	49	49	35	53	77	79			52
MUL	36			73								
PAC												
WHT	56	44	33	58	59	57	56	82	77			
FRL	37	38	37	41	44	38	48	73	69			47

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	54	50	34	52	41	41	49	64	72			43
SWD	12	25	24	19	30	32	10	29				
ELL	42	55	40	39	48	50	29	64	67			43
AMI												
ASN	76	60		80	65		71	90	79			
BLK	50	49	42	36	38	41	40	64	48			
HSP	52	50	34	51	39	38	44	61	74			42
MUL	45			64								
PAC												
WHT	61	50	29	57	40	47	69	70	79			
FRL	43	41	32	43	38	41	40	49	72			31

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	48%	46%	2%	47%	1%
06	2023 - Spring	55%	44%	11%	47%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	53%	53%	0%	54%	-1%
07	2023 - Spring	33%	38%	-5%	48%	-15%
08	2023 - Spring	64%	58%	6%	55%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	53%	50%	3%	44%	9%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	47%	42%	50%	39%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	45%	48%	48%	45%

CIVICS						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	61%	8%	66%	3%

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 that reflected the lowest performance is Mathematics. The percentage proficient decreased by seven percent from fifty-two percent to forty-five percent. The decline in proficiency can be attributed to three new hires in mathematics that were new to the middle school curriculum and instructional best practices. The eighth-grade math course had a total of three teachers; with the final teacher transitioning from being a paraprofessional to instructional in the second semester.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is Mathematics. Proficiency declined from fifty-two percent to forty-five percent, resulting in a seven percent decline. The major contributing factor was fifty percent of the mathematics teachers were new hires. The seventh-grade teachers experienced difficulty planning and implementing instruction for both regular and advanced math courses which resulted in disruption of students' schedules.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was seventh grade mathematics. The state average was forty-eight percent and Odyssey's average was thirty-three percent resulting in fifteen percentage gap. The major contributing factor for the gap in performance was both seventh grade teachers was new to teaching the curricular expectation. Additionally, both teachers were new to teaching middle school students and managing behaviors to ensure academic engagement and attainment.

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 is English Language Arts. Proficiency increased from forty-nine percent to fifty-two percent or three percent from the prior year. Actions that contributed to the increase was the utilization of a push-in model with Tier 1 English Language Arts teachers. Tier 1 teachers collaborated with the classroom teacher and worked in small groups and/or one-to-one to support learning.

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

Approximately twenty percent of the student population has two or more warning sign indicators. The warning indicators of most concern is absenteeism and student performance in ELA and Mathematics. There appears to be a one-to-one correlation between the number of students absent to the number of level one performance on F.A.S.T. for ELA and/or Mathematics.

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

1. Closing percentage gap between students with disabilities and regular education students.
2. Increasing proficiency in English Language Arts
3. Increasing proficiency in Mathematics
4. Improving school-wide culture of school

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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.

Historically, the Students with Disabilities subgroup has not reached the forty-one percent threshold for ESSA. Currently forty percent of sixth, thirty-seven of seventh and fifty-three percent of eight grade students with disabilities were proficient in English Language Arts for the final administration of the FAST ELA. Forty percent of sixth, forty-two percent of seventh and twenty-five percent of eighth grade students with disabilities were proficient in Mathematics on the FAST Mathematics final administration.

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

For the past three years, students with disabilities has underperformed in comparison to peers. The level of proficiency for current students in English Language Arts is thirty-four percent and Mathematics thirty-six percent. In order to increase proficiency in both areas, additional supports have been allocated to the Exceptional Education team. As a result of additional supports, the subgroup, students with disabilities performing at the proficient or above level will increase by seven percent on the final FAST PM3 English Language Arts and by five percent on the FAST PM3 Mathematics assessments.

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

The monitoring of the plan will include but will not be limited to:
1. The teachers of students with a learning disability, SLD, will collect data and be part of the PLCs' meetings with core subject teachers.
2. Ensure that students with disabilities receive and utilize the accommodations afforded to them during during each FAST ELA and FAST Mathematics administration.
3. Formal assessment scores will be interpreted and analyzed to drive instruction and to determine interventions in the academic setting.
4. MTSS team will identify students on an ongoing basis and will make decisions on support level needed by students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gina Grant (gina.grant@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.)

With the addition of additional support personnel, there will be in increased emphasis the Multi-Tiered Support Model. Classrooms that serve students with disabilities as well as other students who struggle with proficiency in English Language Arts will incorporate a rotational model that will include small group instruction and use of technology, Read 180, an intervention program. Each support facilitator only has one subject, English Language Arts or Mathematics to support throughout the day including learning strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for increasing an emphasis on the Multi-tiered support model is to ensure a team is dedicated to regularly review data of students, including students with disabilities, to ensure the necessary supports are available in the classroom to support academic 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.

Ensure that student with disabilities are enrolled in the appropriate classes to receive academic support in ELA and/or Math from support facilitators.

Person Responsible: Barbara Rumph (barbara.rumph@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing as students with disabilities enroll.

Monitor performance data of student with disabilities in ELA and Mathematics and accommodation logs.

Person Responsible: Natalie Kitts (natalie.kitts@ocps.net)

By When: October for FAST PM1 February for FAST PM2 Ongoing for SBUAs

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#2. 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.

Early Warning System:

Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment: 177 students
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment: 144 students

Unproductive negative emotions can lead to low motivation or disengagement, which can negatively impact a student's learning experience and present challenging environments and dynamics for teachers and students. As we focus this school year on best practices for academic engagement, we must consider the relationship between emotions and students' academic performance, and the impact emotions can have on learning, like influencing our ability to process information leading to low motivation or disengagement. We selected three areas from the Spring 2023 Panorama Student Survey: School Climate, School Safety, and Sense of Belonging. We will be focusing on three specific questions, one per area which showed a decrease in the percentage of favorable answers.

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

PANORAMA SURVEY - SPRING 2023

SCHOOL CLIMATE
Question 1: At Your School, how much does the behavior of other students hurt or help your learning?
A tremendous amount: 23 students (4%)
Hurts my learning some: 61 students (11%)

SCHOOL SAFETY
Question 2: How often are people disrespectful to others at your school?
Frequently:185 students (33%)
Almost Always 110 students (19%)
Sometimes:140 students (25%)

SENSE OF BELONGING
Question 3: How connected do you feel to the adults in your school?
Not Connected at all:185 students (33%)
Slightly Connected: 110 students (19%)

PANORAMA Survey - Spring 2024, will show a decrease of 5 students per answer:
Question 1 - (2023) 84 students - (2024) 79 students
Question 2 - (2023) 435 students - (2024) 420 students
Question 3 - (2023) 295 students - (2024) 285 students

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

The monitoring process will combine informal surveys based on the three questions previously identified. Surveys will be created by the student council group: The Dragon Voice and data will be shared with the school administration on our monthly meetings. Data from the Panorama Survey (Fall 2023)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gina Grant (gina.grant@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.)

1. Focus Groups (all grade levels)
Guided conversations about topics of students' interest. (led by SAFE coordinator, Guidance, Social Workers)
2. Mentorship
Students will be assigned to adults on campus who will meet biweekly to check on academics and personal aspects of students' lives
3. Restorative Justice Circles
Understanding each other and respecting differences (led by RJC Training for staff members)
4. Dragons Voice
A selected group of students will meet with admin, PTSA, and staff members to voice ideas and concerns of their grade level. (Led by Ms. Honeycutt - 8th grade Social Studies Teacher)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All the interventions foster open and honest communication allowing students to express their thoughts and emotions clearly, They also enable them to actively listen and empathize with others, promoting positive relationships.

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.

Monitor logs of student service members (school counselors, school social worker and SAFE) monthly.

Person Responsible: Barbara Rumph (barbara.rumph@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly beginning September

Utilize HERO store for student to spend points earned for exhibiting the Dragon Way behaviors on campus and in classroom.

Person Responsible: Javier Maldanado (javier.maldanado@ocps.net)

By When:

#3. 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.

As we continue to focus on increasing student outcomes in the areas of ELA and Math by focusing on the continued implementation and deepening the understanding of the B.E.S.T standards, an area of growth is to intentionally plan for student engagement.
Rationale: Grade level content areas consistently meet as a Professional Learning Community to discuss the standards and student performance on standards-based assessments. Informal classroom walkthrough data revealed that approximately 40% of students were not actively engaged in the lesson or task. During informal and formal observations, approximately 19% of total elements entered was related to the utilization of engagement strategies. Of the 19%, 6.82% was related to organizing students in groups and less than 1% was related to probing questions of low expectancy students. It is important that students are allowed to be an active participant in the lesson in which they demonstrate the level of attainment of the content taught.

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

As a result of focusing on student engagement, the school expects to increase the percentage of Marzano's Using Engagement Strategies from 19% to 30% and Probing Low Expectancy Students from less than 1% to 6%. Through this increased engagement, it is expected that English Language Arts' proficiency for the 2024 FAST PM3 assessment will increase by three percent from fifty-two percent to fifty-five percent. In Mathematics, proficiency for the 2024 FAST PM3 assessment will increase by two percent from forty-five to forty-seven percent.

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

The leadership team will conduct frequent walks and tools in order to monitor engagement strategies utilized on campus. Depending on the nature of the walks, either the school's classroom walkthrough tool or Marzano's iObservation tool will be used to record engagement strategies used.
1. Classroom Walkthrough Tool utilized by leadership team on a weekly basis.
2. Professional Learning Community Minutes weekly.
3. iObservation Building Report Tool utilized monthly.
4. Professional development related to building a collaborative learning culture- how to begin/frame a conversation or response and turn and talk protocol.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Barbara Rumph (barbara.rumph@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 that will be implemented is planning and implementing questioning strategies as referenced by Lilian Martin's article "Classroom Applications of Questioning Strategies." The article supports the school's plan to engage in reviewing CRM resources, reviewing questions and planning questions that not only meets the depth/demand of the standard but to allow students to discuss and be able to ask questions to help students/group clarify or further their thinking about the content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

It is evident from the school's classroom walkthrough data that students are not entirely engaged in learning. Most of the observations during the walkthroughs were whole group instruction. Remarks recorded from the walkthroughs included lessons mostly teacher-led. Little opportunity for students to answer questions or engage in discussion. This was observed for the entirety of the school year. It is important that teacher engage students in the lesson through questioning and group discussions when interacting with new knowledge and deepening their understanding of the content.

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.

Include discussion during PLC meetings about strategies used to engage students.

Person Responsible: Barbara Rumph (barbara.rumph@ocps.net)

By When: Weekly through May

Professional development during faculty meeting to include engagement strategies.

Person Responsible: Natalie Kitts (natalie.kitts@ocps.net)

By When: November January February

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).

In order to support our SWD funds were allocated to purchase the following positions:

1. An SLD teacher- making it the third position on our campus. Teachers are scheduled to push in and pull-out students in Math and Language Arts, as well as teach sections of Learning Strategies.
2. A Reading teacher- making it two on our campus. This teacher will be leading the MTSS team, analyzing data, and identifying students and interventions focused on closing the achievement gap.