Avalon Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Avalon Middle

13914 MAILER BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

https://avalonms.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.

Avalon Middle School embraces Orange County Public Schools' mission statement which is, "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.

Our vision statement also aligns with the Orange County Public Schools' vision statement which is, "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
Williams, Jennifer	Principal	Conduct instructional observations Teacher, resource, and staff evaluation Evaluate and progress monitor data Evaluate Deliberate Practice plans Manages school budget SAC and PTSO liaison Shares district initiatives with leadership and staff Ensure that proper instruction is followed
Algarin, Angie	Assistant Principal	Oversees facilities and operations of the school Conducts instructional observations Teacher and classified staff evaluations Oversees discipline and Title IX Facilitates fire, active assailant and severe weather drills
Anderson, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Oversees instructional support of the school Manages students services Monitors and analysis student progress Monitor students attendance Oversees and creates the master schedule
Brett, Amy	Reading Coach	Creates and provides teacher and staff professional development Organizes and leads peer observations Lead and mentor new teachers Coordinates data analysis for the school and PLC Oversees all school testing Facilitates collaborative planning Collaborates and conducts coaching observations
Santos, German	Dean	6-8th Grade Administrative Dean Conduct Code of Conduct Review Title IX coordinator Bullying investigation/Prevention Grade Level Lunch Supervision Level 4 documentation and facility level 4 meetings
Wax, Shana	Instructional Media	Instructional leaders and coaching support of our teachers Area of coaching assistance Social Studies and leader in that department Staff Development. coordinate training, modeling, coaching, in-house model training days, and assistance with PD. Visits classrooms and assists with observations and teacher support Assist with testing Supervise and manage media center Manage digital plan for our school

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pearson, Erin	Staffing Specialist	ESE liaison to assist families and school personnel with the interpretation of district, state, and federal regulations. Provide strategies to help support our students with IEPs Monitor students' progress based on IEP goals and BIPs Complete IEP meetings and ensure proper consent are completed Completes meetings and ESE manifestations cases. Collaborates with district personal to ensure that the required data and student assessments are completed
Penny, Kelly	Math Coach	Assist with MTSS process and interventions for our students Conducts coaching and modeling for staff Attends common planning and PLC meetings to help teachers and support staff Collaborates with other coaches in order to provide PD that properly support student achievement District contact for the Math Department

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership met and analyzed the school data to help identify the areas for improvement. The leadership team as a whole collaboratively built the needs and discussed potential interventions to meet our needs. During the first faculty meeting, our school principal presented the teachers with the data and shared the areas of need identified by the leadership team. In addition, the school principal was able to share the researched based interventions that were selected by the team. In addition, the SIP will be presented at the School Advisory Council where parents and community leaders will be able to discuss our plan and brainstorm ideas and help support the plan implemented.

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 leadership team will collaborate with Department Professional Learning Community (PLC) leaders to discuss and analyze their data on a bi-weekly base. In addition, the leadership team will collaborate with PLC to discuss state-wide assessments given throughout the year to indicate how we can further support our student's needs and ensure that the plan implemented is bridging the gap for our students. The Department PLC leaders are Language Arts Department Ms. Amy Brett, Mathematics Ms. Kelly Penny, Science Ms. Fadia Ahmed Hussein, Elective teachers Mr. Frank Walsh, and Social Studies Mr. William Harris. These leaders serve as a liaison between departments and leadership to help support and deliver information and data to each department.

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	57%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	32%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	38	42	106
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	23	27	60
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	26	58	109
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	3	25	49
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	

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	17	13	34	64

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	48	45	55	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	28	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	34	45	96
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	17	30	63
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	

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	15	24	32	71

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	0	0	

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	48	45	55	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	28	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	34	45	96
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	17	30	63
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	

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	15	24	32	71

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	0	0	

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*	67	48	49	70	49	50	70		
ELA Learning Gains				58			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			42		
Math Achievement*	85	57	56	79	36	36	70		
Math Learning Gains				73			47		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68			43		
Science Achievement*	74	53	49	66	55	53	73		
Social Studies Achievement*	85	64	68	87	61	58	78		
Middle School Acceleration	93	77	73	93	52	49	82		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	67	43	40	43	79	76	64		

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	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	471
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	681
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	30	Yes	2	1
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN	93			
BLK	74			
HSP	74			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	83			
FRL	69			

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	34	Yes	1	
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	67			
HSP	65			

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%**
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	67			

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	67			85			74	85	93			67
SWD	15			40			25	41			4	
ELL	47			70			54	71	86		6	67
AMI												
ASN	87			95			87	96	98		5	
BLK	68			83			76	61	81		5	
HSP	64			80			65	85	91		6	56
MUL	55			81			92	70	92		5	
PAC												
WHT	66			88			77	89	94		5	
FRL	56			76			62	74	90		6	58

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	70	58	44	79	73	68	66	87	93			43
SWD	13	30	27	29	61	63	13	32				
ELL	51	53	42	65	68	66	32	67	77			43
AMI												
ASN	95	75		95	87		91	100	97			

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
BLK	53	54	52	68	73	75	56	86	89			
HSP	63	55	41	74	74	72	58	79	93			44
MUL	74	62		88	71		75	100	86			
PAC												
WHT	73	58	44	81	71	61	70	90	92			
FRL	54	53	51	70	76	75	55	77	91			

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	70	56	42	70	47	43	73	78	82			64
SWD	10	24	24	20	41	40	25	17	29			
ELL	38	61	63	43	50	50	21	48	46			64
AMI												
ASN	87	71		91	53		90	83	90			
BLK	61	49	19	46	30	25	57	83	54			
HSP	63	60	46	60	43	42	66	70	77			61
MUL	64	59		76	50		50	90	62			
PAC												
WHT	75	51	38	78	51	48	79	82	88			
FRL	58	56	42	56	41	44	58	71	71			67

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	58%	45%	13%	47%	11%
08	2023 - Spring	62%	46%	16%	47%	15%

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	74%	44%	30%	47%	27%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	91%	53%	38%	54%	37%
07	2023 - Spring	29%	38%	-9%	48%	-19%
08	2023 - Spring	81%	58%	23%	55%	26%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	72%	50%	22%	44%	28%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	47%	52%	50%	49%

GEOMETRY

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

CIVICS

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	61%	23%	66%	18%

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 showed the lowest performance was our ESE subgroup. Our ESE students continue to demonstrate less growth than our other subgroups. Not only are they coming in with significant learning gaps; other possible contributing factors could be linked to teacher knowledge of strategies to use for our ESE population, teacher use of appropriate scaffolding, and lack of growth mindset and confidence with this subgroup. In order to address this gap, there needs to be targeted progress monitoring throughout the school year, professional learning in differentiation and downward scaffolds, as well as continue to build a culture of growth mindset. We are also strategically scheduling our neediest students in double block ELA and Math with a co-taught support facilitation model

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

Areas of decline that we noticed from the previous year were our Civics and English Language Arts. Civics from 90% to 86% proficiency. English Language Arts from 70% to 68% proficiency. The impact of the ELA has contributed to the decline in Civics as well. Our 7th-grade group as a whole came in with a lower proficiency than the rest of our grade levels. Our 7th grade group seems to have the highest discipline referrals as well as attendance referrals than the other grade levels.

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.

Our ESE subgroup demonstrated the largest gap differential. 22% of our ESE students were proficient in ELA compared to 72% of our Non-ESE students meeting proficiency. Our ESE students are coming to us with significant learning gaps-greater than other subgroups. Other possible contributing factors could be linked to teacher knowledge of appropriate research-based strategies to use for our ESE population, appropriate use of scaffolding in the classroom, and lack of confidence and growth-mindset in this subgroup of students

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

According to our 2022-23 FSSA data, we demonstrate improvement in our Mathematics scores. 80% of our students were proficient in Mathematics 6-8 and 99% of our Algebra students who were tested were proficient and 100% of our Geometry students were proficient. Our math teachers will continue to implement the same strategies used during the last school year. The team planned lessons together, provided tutoring, and collaborated with families to support our students and deepen their skills in math.

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

One potential area of concern is our ESE subgroup. 78% of that subgroup was not proficient in ELA.

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

The highest priority for our school improvement would be in Professional Development, interventions, tutoring, and overall focus will be our ESE subgroups in ELA.

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.

On the Spring ELA FSA, our ESE students performed at 22% proficient and 78% of our ESE students were not proficient. There is a significant gap between the proficiency of ESE students compared to our Non-ESE students in all content areas. Our area of focus is to increase our ELA student achievement in our ESE population. This focus area addresses the division priority of narrowing the achievement gap. We believe that we can close this gap by providing and monitoring targeted support systems. We will provide and encourage professional learning that enhances teacher understanding of researched-based instructional strategies that target the different ways this student population learns best as well as enhance teacher use of scaffolding to ensure all students are meeting goals. Lastly, we will facilitate a growth mindset by focusing on building relationships with and confidence in our ESE students.

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

Our goal is to reduce the achievement gaps for our ESE population by at least 3% as measured by state assessments in English Language Arts, Math, Science, and Civics during 2023-24 school year.

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

The area of focus will be monitored by the review of data, professional learning community analysis of that data and administrator and resource personnel will regularly review student performance. Administrators and resource personnel will regularly meet with departments to discuss and adjust support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Anderson (michelle.anderson@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 be using the Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS) and other interventions including tutoring as well as push-in and pull-out support in targeted classrooms.

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

The Multi-Tiered Support System as well as other identified interventions to provide will allow for differentiated support of targeted students in their classrooms.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Instructional coaches and the MTSS Coordinator will provide appropriate professional development to help teachers understand the most effective strategies to use for the targeted students.

Person Responsible: Amy Brett (amy.brett@ocps.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

Master schedule is created to optimize placement of students in courses and period with additional support personnel

Person Responsible: Michelle Anderson (michelle.anderson@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Administrators and the MTSS coordinator will work with the Intervention Specialists to identify specific students who need additional support in their core classes.

Person Responsible: Michelle Anderson (michelle.anderson@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Intervention Specialists will push into specific classes to provide additional support.

Person Responsible: Kelly Penny (kelly.penny@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Implementation of Peers as Partners in Learning course where students push in to support targeted ESE students.

Person Responsible: Erin Pearson (erin.pearson@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

#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.

One focus area is ensuring that our scholars have a stronger sense of belonging. This focus area is critical as students cannot meet their full academic potential unless their social-emotional needs are addressed. Given the challenges we continue to face, we believe that it is essential for us to identify our students' social-emotional needs and provide appropriate support systems for students who are struggling

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

By the end of the school year, there will be an increase of student connectedness and sense of belonging to our school. There will be at least a 3% increase in the area of sense of belonging on our Panorama survey completed by our students, a decrease of at least 3% in the number of students who are absent more than 10% of days per year, and a 2% decrease in the number of students who are suspended more than one time per school year.

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

The Principal will meet with a student focus group to hear students' voices, address areas of need and celebrate successes. We will monitor the quarterly EWS data and the bi-annual student Panorama survey results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angie Algarin (angie.algarin@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.)

A student's sense of belonging in middle school can impact a student's discipline and attendance at school. The leadership team will focus on analyzing the discipline data and attendance to ensure that our students feel a sense of belonging and therefore is not impacting their academics as well as their sense of feeling like they are part of the school community.

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

Studies have shown that students who do not attend school or have poor discipline could be due to their ability to connect with individual adults or other students within their school. At Avalon Middle, the leadership team will collaborate in order to help students with our mentoring program. Students will be identified by our Early Warning Systems data so that we can focus on those with poor attendance and frequent discipline referrals.

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.

Leadership team will mentor identified students who have multiple EWS indicators

Person Responsible: Amy Brett (amy.brett@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Monitor frequency of absences and work with parents and school social worker to remove perceived and real barriers to attendance

Person Responsible: Michelle Anderson (michelle.anderson@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

The discipline team will implement MTSS behavior for students with frequent suspensions and will utilize the Base Education program during the PASS class to help support students remain in class and out of suspension.

Person Responsible: Angie Algarin (angie.algarin@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Teachers will implement resiliency instruction that is data-driven to help support our students during social studies and other dedicated class periods

Person Responsible: Angie Algarin (angie.algarin@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

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 last area of focus is to provide rigorous standards-based instruction for all students with an emphasis on literacy skills. This focus area addresses the division's priority of ensuring college and career readiness. 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. As a middle school, our students are transitioning from a focus on the elementary school task of learning to read to the task of reading to learn. We believe that an emphasis on literacy skills will help all of our students be successful with rigorous standards-based instruction.

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

By the end of the school year, there will be at least a 3% increase our ELA, math, civics and science overall achievement scores.

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

Progress monitoring with FAST and PMA data. iObservation data from classroom walkthroughs and observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Williams (jennifer.williams@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.)

Build the capacity of content teachers in identifying at-risk students, using acceleration strategies and progress monitoring. It includes the rationale/identification, exploring strategies, application, peer observation, and progress monitoring. In addition, we will continue to use a variety of close reading and writing strategies in all of our classrooms. The strategies will focus on summarizing, making connections, and going deeper into the content text. Identification of at-risk students, use of acceleration strategies, and progress monitoring to help address unfinished learning as well as academic inequities to close achievement gaps. We used our data along with an analysis of the state assessment requirements to make this determination.

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 student achievement in literacy skills using data from common assessments, writing prompts, and FAST. In addition, evidence of teacher implementation of literacy strategies and differentiated instruction will be collected using the iObservation system along with data from language arts common assessments, writing prompts, and FAST. 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.

Increase staff knowledge and understanding of effective instructional strategies utilizing the new BEST standards through professional development and Professional Learning Community discussions.

Person Responsible: Amy Brett (amy.brett@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Provide follow up support to teachers through observations and coaching.

Person Responsible: Amy Brett (amy.brett@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

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 leadership team will meet and periodically review data. Based on the needs noticed, the team will select future researched based evidence resources to meet our students' needs. At this time, the team is utilizing MTSS and ESE support facilitation which is provided by our general budge and ESE budget. At this time, the ESSA funds were used for Tutoring and summer school if they are still available.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$19,081.51
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	510000	4510000000	1763 - Avalon Middle	General Fund		$8,000.00
			Notes: Tutoring			
	520000	4230010000	1763 - Avalon Middle	IDEA		$11,081.51
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				$29,184.03
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	640000	4130000000	1763 - Avalon Middle	General Fund		$19,456.02
			Notes: SAI - Partial salary for resource teacher			

	640000	4130000000	1763 - Avalon Middle	General Fund		$9,728.01
			Notes: SRI - Partial salary for resource teacher			
					Total:	**$48,265.54**

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No