

Orange County Public Schools

College Park Middle



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

College Park Middle

1201 MAURY RD, Orlando, FL 32804

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

Demographics

Principal: Sanjay Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2020

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brown, Sanjay	Principal	
Nelson, Martha	Assistant Principal	
Slattery, Deanna	Instructional Coach	
Morris , Carol	Instructional Coach	
Williams, Isis	Dean	
Lewis, Francella	Dean	
Hurst, Kristy	Other	
Jay, Jill	Guidance Counselor	
Mcewen, Kristina	Guidance Counselor	
Smith, Monique	Teacher, ESE	
Hill, Austin	Other	
Alvarado, Wanda	Other	
Barringer, Alexandra	Instructional Media	
Pearce, Hollie	Assistant Principal	
Kilpatrick, Michael	Dean	
Whitman, Megan	Guidance Counselor	
Roach, Bralin	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/29/2020, Sanjay Brown

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

54

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	281	270	263	0	0	0	0	814
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	56	81	0	0	0	0	177
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	62	73	0	0	0	0	150
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	91	54	0	0	0	0	168
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	84	17	0	0	0	0	128
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	66	64	0	0	0	0	198
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	75	66	0	0	0	0	213

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	108	109	0	0	0	0	286

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	12

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	286	280	302	0	0	0	0	868
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	69	68	0	0	0	0	189
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	99	99	0	0	0	0	280
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	127	124	0	0	0	0	348
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	169	129	0	0	0	0	409

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	144	133	0	0	0	0	379

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year							1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times							3	5	3	0	0	0	0	11

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	286	280	302	0	0	0	0	868
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	69	68	0	0	0	0	189
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	99	99	0	0	0	0	280
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	127	124	0	0	0	0	348
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	169	129	0	0	0	0	409

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	144	133	0	0	0	0	379

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	11

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	41%	52%	54%	36%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	52%	54%	37%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	45%	47%	31%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	41%	55%	58%	42%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	45%	55%	57%	47%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	50%	51%	39%	44%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	51%	51%	46%	51%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	48%	67%	72%	59%	68%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	42%	52%	-10%	54%	-12%
	2018	28%	48%	-20%	52%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	28%	48%	-20%	52%	-24%
	2018	39%	48%	-9%	51%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
	2018	37%	55%	-18%	58%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	24%	43%	-19%	55%	-31%
	2018	18%	35%	-17%	52%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	34%	49%	-15%	54%	-20%
	2018	36%	51%	-15%	54%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
08	2019	29%	36%	-7%	46%	-17%
	2018	29%	32%	-3%	45%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	42%	49%	-7%	48%	-6%
	2018	44%	49%	-5%	50%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	44%	66%	-22%	71%	-27%
2018	57%	66%	-9%	71%	-14%
Compare		-13%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	71%	63%	8%	61%	10%
2018	88%	61%	27%	62%	26%
Compare		-17%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	78%	53%	25%	57%	21%
2018	88%	65%	23%	56%	32%
Compare		-10%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	24	32	24	24	35	32	33	36			
ELL	29	41	38	36	54	52	38	43			
ASN	71	61		89	63				90		
BLK	32	42	36	29	40	41	29	39	59		
HSP	38	51	50	45	55	65	48	49	76		
MUL	55	40		41	41						
WHT	71	59	38	68	50	35	78	81	74		
FRL	32	44	38	32	41	41	34	40	60		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	12	26	29	17	24	22	27	20			
ELL	13	33	34	27	35	32		40			
ASN	70	59		85	85		60		92		
BLK	23	31	31	29	39	36	27	52	80		
HSP	35	33	20	43	46	47	42	46	83		
MUL	54	43		52	61						
WHT	66	51	47	72	63	50	76	81	92		
FRL	29	33	30	33	41	39	33	55	81		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	464
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	75
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	44

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant 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 area showing the lowest statistical performance was English Language Arts Lowest 25% showing a positive gain year over year of 7 points but an overall proficiency rate of 38%. Contributing factors included teacher turnover and providing the appropriate level of support for new teachers or teachers implementing new or unfamiliar instructional practices. Additionally, our implementation and monitoring of the iReady intervention program contributed to overall low proficiency in English Language Arts.

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

The area with the greatest decline occurred in our Acceleration. Teacher turnover and providing the appropriate level of support for new and temporary teachers was a primary contributing factor to this decline. Tutoring was poorly attended after school, on Saturdays and during review periods in December and Spring Break. Additionally, several students were accelerated prior to the school year without sufficient foundational skills and many struggled with the advanced curriculum.

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 area with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Social Studies Achievement. The current gap stands at 24 points with College Park's achievement showing 48% compared to the state's 72% proficiency rate. Contributing factors included inconsistent implementation of instructional best practices. Despite the support provided to teachers achievement scores were inconsistent among the different teachers indicating that the level of support was insufficient in particular areas. Additionally, the review process, tutoring support, academic support and learning camp implementation was poorly attended.

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

The area showing the most growth is English Language Arts Learning Gains. The entire department showed growth. The level of consistent instruction due to steady teacher attendance and low turnover within the department contributed to this improvement. Additionally, the Literacy coach was able to provide a high level of consistent support for all teachers including: conducting PLCs, modeling lessons, and assisting teachers in the planning and preparing for instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

When reviewing the data, the areas of most concern are the number of suspensions (280) during the past school year and number of course failures in Math and ELA (348) are extremely concerning.

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

1. Increase Math proficiency, learning gains and lowest 25%
* Increase Acceleration proficiency
2. Increase English Language Arts proficiency, learning gains and lowest 25%
3. Increase Civics proficiency
4. Increase Science Proficiency
5. Reduce referrals leading to suspensions

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will increase proficiency levels in Math and English Language Arts from 41% to 50%.

Measureable Outcome: We anticipate an impact of culture and climate can improve our Early Warning Systems indicator data by decreasing the percentage of students with two or more indicators from 35% to 30%. Additionally we anticipate that culture and climate will also improve student achievement data by increasing the proficiency levels in Math and English Language Arts from 41% to 50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Hollie Pearce (hollie.pearce@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

We will use a process to examine the current school climate and culture. Determine relevant strategies to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration across the school and implement strategies for social and emotional learning with adults and students to positively impact school climate and culture.

Person Responsible Austin Hill (austin.hill@ocps.net)

We will establish a common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning at your school with adults and students.

Person Responsible Austin Hill (austin.hill@ocps.net)

We will use cycles of professional learning that integrate academics and social and emotional learning where faculty and staff will understand how social and emotional learning is connected to instructional strategies and understand the connections between social and emotional learning and instructional strategies.

Person Responsible Deanna Slattery (deanna.slattery@ocps.net)

We will monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts

Person Responsible Deanna Slattery (deanna.slattery@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

We will increase English Language Arts proficiency, learning gains and lowest 25%. English Language Arts is a core subject that continues to lag behind the state and district averages.

Measureable Outcome:

We intend to raise proficiency in ELA from 41% to 50%, learning gains from 47% to 55% and our rising lowest 25% from 38% to 45%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Hollie Pearce (hollie.pearce@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. An instructional focus calendar will be created for all ELA grade levels
 - PLC agendas will be designed and set for consistency by school leadership.
2. Instructional monitoring, feedback and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational data.
 - Coach will create a monitoring schedule to provide feedback regarding effective implementation of standards-based instruction.
 - School-based leadership team members will collaborate to analyze data and tier teachers for targeted coaching support.
 - Monitor student data weekly with a strategic focus on student subgroups.
 - Professional development opportunities will be offered to all staff members based on areas for growth. (Sample topics: academic notebooks, data chats and instructional best practices)
3. Professional development on reading integration embedded throughout the school year.
 - teachers will receive professional development on embedding vocabulary in lessons
 - use of songs and chants to increase retention of literacy strategies and concepts
4. Frequent and consistent classroom walkthroughs to address effectiveness of instruction
5. Data PLCs designed to address deficiencies in instruction, spiral review, and remediation plans based on data collection

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Instructional Focus Calendars will help focus our work on critical areas of instruction.
2. Coaching cycles will help to provide support to all teachers.
3. Professional development will be necessary to train teachers on effective instruction.
4. Rotational models will help to ensure students who are struggling receive direct instruction on areas of need with their teacher.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create English Language Framework
2. Plan based on instructional framework
3. Implement instructional framework
4. Monitor and adjust based on data
5. Remediate and spiral review as necessary

Person Responsible

Deanna Slattery (deanna.slattery@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We will increase Math Proficiency, Learning Gains and Lowest 25%. This area of instruction lags behind the district and state. The low proficiency in Math therefore constitutes in area of dire need.

Measureable Outcome: We intend to raise proficiency in Math from 41% to 50%, learning gains from 45% to 55% and our rising lowest 25% from 44% to 50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sanjay Brown (sanjay.brown@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Instructional monitoring, feedback and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational data.
 - Math Coach will create a monitoring schedule to provide feedback regarding effective implementation of standards-based instruction.
 - Framework of instruction will be created to address instruction and the Instructional Focus Calendar.
 - School-based leadership team members will collaborate to analyze data and tier teachers for targeted coaching support.

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Monitor student data weekly with a strategic focus on student subgroups.
- Professional development will be offered to all staff members based on areas for growth. (Sample topics: academic notebooks, CUBE Strategy and instructional best practices)

2. Coaching Cycles will be conducted by Math Coach.
3. Lessons will be modeled to help on-board new teachers.
4. Frequent and consistent classroom walkthroughs will be performed to address effectiveness of instruction.
5. Data PLCs will be designed to address deficiencies in instruction and remediation plans based on data collection.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Monitoring, providing feedback and coaching are effective ways to open dialogue with instructors on their practice.
2. Coaching Cycles are key to ensuring coaching is taking effect in teaching strategies.
3. Modeling proper teaching technique and content delivery ultimately aides teachers in their class practices.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Instructional delivery and student data will be monitored by school leadership
2. Principal and Assistant Principals will visit grade-level common planning sessions weekly. Planning will be monitored to ensure standard based instruction is planned.
3. Weekly class monitoring will be conducted by principal and assistant principal using classroom walk-through tool. Daily calibration by

administrators and weekly calibration leadership team members

4. Data PLC will be conducted monthly to assess progress and adjustments needed to meet student needs -

5. Teachers will be tiered based on class visit data (Tier 3 - proficient
Orange - 0581 - College Park Middle - 2019-20 SIP

Last Modified: 7/30/2020 <https://www.floridacims.org> Page 17 of 24

teachers, Tier 2 - emerging teachers Tier 1 -teachers needing additional support). Teachers needing additional support will receive weekly

walkthroughs with face to face feedback. Tier 2 teachers will receive biweekly walkthroughs with face to face feedback and Tier 1 teachers will

receive monthly walkthroughs with a face to face feedback.

6. Sign in sheets/agenda will be utilized to monitor attendance and set discourse for each planning meeting. Additionally, deliverables in lessons produced and student data will be tied to planning.

7. iReady data will be analyzed at the beginning of year, mid year and end of year. Predicted proficiency and student growth will monitored with adjustments planned based on student progress or lack thereof. This step will be undertaken by all leadership team members.

8. Transmath implementation for identified level 1 students to ensure academic growth.

Person

Responsible

Carol Morris (carol.morris@ocps.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

We will increase Civics Proficiency. Civics proficiency decreased from 59% in 2018 to 48% in 2019.

Measureable Outcome:

Civics proficiency will increase from 48% to 60%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Martha Nelson (martha.nelson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Spiral review of key standards in Civics.
 2. Effective PLC planning weekly with 8th Grade Administrator.
 3. Instructional monitoring, feedback and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational data.
 4. Data analysis and planned intervention to address school needs.
-Professional development opportunities will be offered to all staff members based on areas for growth. (Sample topics: academic notebooks, number talks and instructional best practices)
 5. Provide opportunities for students to showcase applications using projects and group interaction.
- Integration of project based learning to use information learned in Civics to solve real world problems
 6. Frequent and consistent classroom walkthroughs to address effectiveness of instruction.
 7. Data PLCs designed to address deficiencies in instruction and remediation plans based on data collection.
1. Coaching and monitoring instructions allows instructors to address key deficiencies
 2. Professional development will aid teachers in learning new strategies they can use to impact student learning.
 3. Group interaction is shown to improve retention in students

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

1. Plan for instruction and create Instructional Focus Calendars
2. Address the progression of learning over time through core teaching strategies
3. Create rotational model to address deficiencies in learning
4. Spiral review with flashcards and implement use of mock test
5. Review and remediate as necessary

Person Responsible

Martha Nelson (martha.nelson@ocps.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We will increase Science Proficiency. Science proficiency decreased from 46% in 2018 to 44% in 2019.

Measureable Outcome: Science proficiency will increase from 44% to 50%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Martha Nelson (martha.nelson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. An instructional focus calendar will be created for all Science grade levels.
 - PLC agendas will be designed and set for consistency by school leadership
2. Instructional monitoring, feedback and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational data.
 - Coach will create a monitoring schedule to provide feedback regarding effective implementation of standards-based instruction.
 - School-based leadership team members will collaborate to analyze data and tier teachers for targeted coaching support.
 - Monitor student data weekly with a strategic focus on student subgroups.
 - Professional development opportunities will be offered to all staff members based on areas for growth. (Sample topics: academic notebooks, data chats and instructional best practices)
3. Professional development on Science instruction and support of 8th grade teachers through direct modeling.
4. Frequent and consistent classroom walkthroughs to address effectiveness of instruction.
5. Data PLCs designed to address deficiencies in instruction and remediation plans based on data collection.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Instructional Focus Calendars will help focus our work on critical areas of instruction
2. Coaching cycles will help to provide support to all teachers
3. Professional development will be necessary to train teachers on effective instruction
4. Rotational models will help to ensure students who are struggling receive direct instruction on areas of need with their teacher.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Plan for instruction based on standards and Scope and Sequence
2. Implement standards based instruction

3. Monitor implementation of standards based instruction
4. Adjust based on data
5. Create interventions to address deficiencies.

Person Responsible Martha Nelson (martha.nelson@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

We will need to address the following this school year.

1. New teacher on-boarding

- * **Weekly and monthly meetings to address concerns**
- * **Tiered teachers for walkthroughs and observations**
- * **Consistent monitoring of instruction**

2. Teacher attendance

- * **Incentivized attendance**
- * **Attendance acknowledgement**
- * **Wellness emphasis**

3. Testing Environment on par with FSA testing

- * **Preparation and monitoring of testing environment on all school-wide testing**

4. Classroom Management

- * **Dean and administrative support on consistent rotations**

5. Mental Health Services to students

- * **Students service groups**
- * **Counseling sessions**
- * **Leadership classes**
- * **All-Star tutoring/mentoring**
- * **Leadership team mentoring**

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

One of the ways we are able to ensure that all stakeholders are involved is by using a distributive leadership model. We have a leadership team that is made up of lead team members representing each of the different goals for our campus. These teams communicate

with the stakeholders who are most involved in their area of expertise. When the leadership team meets together we are able to make sure that the voice of our stakeholders are brought to the table as we monitor our progress and make decisions about next steps in each of our school improvement goals.

Our SAFE and school counselor team is in place to attend training and coordinate school-wide programs and services to prevent violence (Bullying, conflicts, fighting, etc.) and to address other social emotional learning needs. Student Services will implement prevention programs to include: school environment surveys that assess policies/procedures related to violent/aggressive behavior; writing the school crisis plan; attending and participating in all Threat Assessment meetings; assessing violence prevention curricula, instructional strategies, professional development and parent/community resources; providing and tracking mental health counseling referrals for students and families; and providing community resources to parents for various social/emotional support.

Our discipline team is in place to create systems and structures for restorative justice and positive behavior support practices. They will provide professional development for teachers in these areas as well as culturally responsive instructional practices. This team will be creating a mentorship program that ensures our "at promise/risk" students have an adult on campus who will be guiding them through all aspects of the educational experience.

The administrative team of College Park Middle School will ensure that instruction is provided by highly qualified teachers; provide high quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, paraprofessionals, and others as appropriate; implement strategies to attract high quality and qualified teachers to high needs schools; increase parental involvement in student achievement, in accordance with the requirements in section 1118; include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessment in order to improve the achievement of individual students and the overall instructional program; provide timely and effective assistance for students having difficulty meeting the proficient and advanced levels of academic performance; and coordinate Title 1 with other Federal, State, and local resources, and services.

The administration team at College Park Middle School will ensure that each homeless student have equal access to the same free, appropriate public education, provided to other students. Further, homeless students will have access to the education and other services needed to ensure that they have an opportunity to meet the same challenging state student academic achievement standards to which all students are held.

The administration team at College Park Middle School will provide our academic intervention programs that are used to help students gain knowledge and to ensure students not be left behind. Supplemental instruction strategies may include, but are not limited to: modified curriculum, reading instruction, intensive math instruction, after-school instruction, tutoring, mentoring, class size reduction, and intensive skills development.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$1,000.00
----------	---------------	---	-------------------

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	1110	140-Substitute Teachers	0581 - College Park Middle	General Fund		\$1,000.00	
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA					\$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	1110	140-Substitute Teachers	0581 - College Park Middle	General Fund		\$1,000.00	
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math					\$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	1110	140-Substitute Teachers	0581 - College Park Middle	General Fund		\$1,000.00	
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies					\$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	1110	140-Substitute Teachers	0581 - College Park Middle	General Fund		\$1,000.00	
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science					\$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	1110	140-Substitute Teachers	0581 - College Park Middle	General Fund		\$1,000.00	
Total:						\$5,000.00	