Orange County Public Schools

College Park Middle



2018-19 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Information | 4 |
| Needs Assessment | 8 |
| Planning for Improvement | 11 |
| Title I Requirements | 15 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 18 |

College Park Middle

1201 MAURY RD, Orlando, FL 32804

https://collegeparkms.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served

(per MSID File)

Middle School 6-8 2018-19 Title I School

Yes

2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate

(As Reported on Survey 3)

100%

Primary Service Type

(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate

(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

81%

School Grades History

| Year | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | С | С | С | C* |

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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 and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Title |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Brown, Sanjay | Principal |
| Kolling, Carl | Dean |
| Carr, Alex | Instructional Coach |
| Erisman, Amy | Teacher, ESE |
| Harris, William | Assistant Principal |
| Cavey, Jacob | Dean |

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making

Team members include: Sanjay Brown, Courtney Wilson, William Harris, Jr., Dr. Alexander Carr, Deborah Turner, Deanna Slattery, Amy Erisman, Jill Jay, Jacob Cavey, Carl Kolling, Karen Reid, Katherine Estes, Wanda Alvarado and Alexandra Barringer

Sanjay Brown, Principal is responsible for articulation of the school's mission, vision, and goals. As the instructional leader of the school, it is Mr. Brown's responsibility to ensure that

the learning environment is rigorous, engaging, and accessible to all students that are served at

College Park Middle School. Maintaining an intense focus on student achievement requires continuous

progress monitoring of student academic growth, data-based decision making, timely feedback to

teachers regarding classroom observations, and a focused approach to lesson plan writing. Mr. Brown ensures that the vision of the school is communicated through facilitation of weekly

professional learning communities, staff professional development opportunities, as well as on-going

conversations to staff, parents, and the community.

As an instructional leader, Mr. Brown ensures that both Dr. Courtney Wilson and Mr. William Harris, Jr.,

Assistant Principals, are communicating the school's mission, vision, and goals in the same capacity that he does.

Dr. Courtney Wilson, Assistant Principal is responsible for ensuring the mission, vision and goals are executed with fidelity. Dr. Wilson primarily focuses on English Language Arts and Science instruction. Additionally, she ensures that guidance counselors are adequately meeting the socio-emotional and academics needs of all students. Dr. Wilson collaborates with the leadership team on a schoolwide focus of instruction and articulates the vision of our district and school leadership. Furthermore, Dr. Wilson, ensures that teachers are developing interventions through progress monitoring and instructional focus calendars. She is also responsible for ensuring that teachers are carrying out the planned interventions to provide the students with the highest quality of instruction possible. She assists teachers with reading strategies that address needs based on assessment data and works with the reading teachers individually to provide extra support and to maintain fidelity with the reading programs in use at College Park Middle School.

William Harris, Jr., Assistant Principal is primarily responsible for the Social Studies, Electives, Administrative Deans and is a member of the Literacy Leadership Team. Additionally, she ensures that all deans are adequately meeting the socio-emotional, behavioral and academics needs of all students. Mr. Harris collaborates with the leadership team on a schoolwide focus of instruction and articulates the vision of our district and school leadership. Furthermore, Mr. Harris, ensures that teachers are developing interventions through progress monitoring and instructional focus calendars. He is also responsible for ensuring that teachers are carrying out the planned interventions to provide the students with the highest quality of instruction possible. He assists teachers with instructional support that addresses student needs based on assessment data and works with his assigned teachers individually to provide extra support and to maintain fidelity with instructional programs in use at College Park Middle School. He also assists the team in ensuring student behavioral support systems are administered correctly and consistently by staff, collecting data to determine if these systems are reducing negative student behavior while increasing academic achievement.

Dr. Alex Carr, Curriculum Resource Teacher assists teachers in developing instructional strategies which will address specific needs based on benchmark data and classroom observation.

Deborah Turner, Math Coach assists teachers with math strategies/interventions that address the needs based on CRM, iReady, common assessment and other data. She also provides individual support to teachers and models as needed. She assists in creating common assessments that follow the district scope and sequence and FSA test item specifications.

Deanna Slattery, Reading Coach supports teachers and students with reading/grammar interventions and strategies that address student learning deficiencies and enrichment

to all students. She provides individual support to students and staff members as needed. Additionally, Ms. Slattery advises the leadership team in addressing reading across all disciplines.

Amy Erisman identifies ESE students that have learning disabilities or behavior disorders that have

traditionally impeded student achievement in the classroom. She collects data to ensure that IEP

accommodations are met and revises IEP's when necessary to assist students is mastering content.

Jill Jay, Guidance Counselor supports students and teachers by ensuring proper placement of students in rigorous academic courses. She serves as a liaison between teachers and students while supporting student academic growth. Mrs. Jay is a student advocate who supports the socio-emotional and academic needs of her assigned grades levels and works to ensure academic success.

Carl Kolling assists teachers and students with behavior interventions and positive behavior support.

He also ensures the safety and well-being of students and staff on campus and builds relationships

with students by understanding their interests and backgrounds.

Karen Reid assists teachers and students with behavior interventions and positive behavior support.

She also ensure the safety and well-being of students and staff on campus and builds relationships

with students by understanding their interests and backgrounds.

Katherine Estes, Testing Coordinator supports students and teachers by ensuring access to testing resources and collects data for disaggregation that targets students specific learnings needs. Additionally, Mrs. Estes works with instructors to ensure tests are targeted to evaluate state standards. Reliable and valid data is collected to make decisions on instructional support.

Wanda Alvarado, District IB Coordinator supports students and teachers by providing professional development and guidance in the execution of IB strategies and instruction.

Jacob Cavey assists teachers and students with behavior interventions and positive behavior support.

She also ensure the safety and well-being of students and staff on campus and builds relationships

with students by understanding their interests and backgrounds.

Alexandra Barringer, Media Specialist supports students through the acquisition of engaging literature and advises instructors and leadership team members on current literature. Additionally, Mrs. Barringer ensures that classrooms are rich with texts that will support instruction.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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

| Indianta | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 71 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 57 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 218 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 159 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 463 |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | IULai |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 77 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 257 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 5/30/2018

Year 2016-17 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|-----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | iotai |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 70 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 231 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 91 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 266 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 17 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 48 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Tatal |
|--|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 36 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |

Year 2016-17 - Updated

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|-----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | IOLAI |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 70 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 231 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 91 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 266 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 17 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 48 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | iotai |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 36 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

ELA performed the lowest with a proficiency rate of 36%. The trajectory of the data constitutes a downward trend as it comes after a two year period of stagnation followed by a 4% point decline. Additionally, learning gains in ELA have also decline 2% while there has a been a 1% rise in the bottom 25% of students over the three year period.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The greatest decline came from the ELA proficiency rate. Prior year data shows a 40% proficiency rate which declined during the 2017-2018 by 4%. Additionally, learning gains in ELA have also decline 2% while there has a been a 1% rise in the bottom 25% of students over the three year period.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The data component that had the biggest gap compared to the state average was ELA with a 17 point gap.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Social Studies proficiency showed the most improvement over the last three years. 2016-2017 shows a proficiency rate of 43% which increased to 50% during the 2017-2018. The trend has continued with 59% of students showing proficiency. The three year increase constitutes a 16% gain.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area

During the 2017-2018 school year additional support was provided by the school's learning community. The master schedule was amended to allow for planning that could be monitored by administrators. Additionally, PLCs targeted lesson planning that was monitored for delivery and student deliverables. A plan was put in place to ensure instruction was monitored and actionable feedback provided to improve instruction.

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 | | 2018 | | 2017 | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|--|--|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | | | |
| ELA Achievement | 36% | 52% | 53% | 40% | 52% | 52% | | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | 37% | 50% | 54% | 39% | 53% | 54% | | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 31% | 42% | 47% | 31% | 42% | 44% | | | |
| Math Achievement | 42% | 53% | 58% | 43% | 53% | 56% | | | |
| Math Learning Gains | 47% | 51% | 57% | 41% | 55% | 57% | | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 39% | 44% | 51% | 37% | 48% | 50% | | | |
| Science Achievement | 46% | 51% | 52% | 37% | 49% | 50% | | | |
| Social Studies Achievement | 59% | 68% | 72% | 44% | 67% | 70% | | | |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Lev | Total | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| indicator | 6 | 7 | 8 | IOLAI |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 72 (90) | 71 (70) | 52 (71) | 195 (231) |
| One or more suspensions | 4 (114) | 7 (91) | 9 (61) | 20 (266) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 76 (36) | 57 (17) | 85 (21) | 218 (74) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 170 (51) | 159 (48) | 134 (26) | 463 (125) |

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 State Comparison | | School- State Comparison | | | |
| 06 | 2018 | 28% | 48% | -20% | 52% | -24% | | | |
| | 2017 | 44% | 52% | -8% | 52% | -8% | | | |
| Same Grade C | -16% | | | | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2018 | 39% | 48% | -9% | 51% | -12% | | | |
| | 2017 | 36% | 52% | -16% | 52% | -16% | | | |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 3% | | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -5% | | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2018 | 37% | 55% | -18% | 58% | -21% | | | |
| | 2017 | 36% | 52% | -16% | 55% | -19% | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | _ | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--------|----------|---|-----|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District State Comparison | | School- State Comparison | | |
| 06 | 2018 | 18% | 35% | -17% | 52% | -34% | | |
| | 2017 | 36% | 43% | -7% | 51% | -15% | | |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -18% | | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2018 | 36% | 51% | -15% | 54% | -18% | | |
| | 2017 | 42% | 52% | -10% | 53% | -11% | | |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -6% | | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2018 | 29% | 32% | -3% | 45% | -16% | | |
| | 2017 | 30% | 30% | 0% | 46% | -16% | | |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | · | | | |
| Cohort Com | -13% | | | | | | | |

| | | BIOLO | GY EOC | | |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| 2017 | | | | | |
| | | CIVI | CS EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 57% | 66% | -9% | 71% | -14% |
| 2017 | 43% | 67% | -24% | 69% | -26% |
| Co | | | | | |
| | | HISTO | RY EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| 2017 | | | | | |
| | | ALGE | BRA EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 88% | 61% | 27% | 62% | 26% |
| 2017 | 59% | 53% | 6% | 60% | -1% |
| Сс | mpare | 29% | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|--|--|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State | | |
| 2018 | 88% | 65% | 23% | 56% | 32% | | |
| 2017 | 83% | 43% | 40% | 53% | 30% | | |
| Co | ompare | 5% | | | | | |

| Subgroup Data | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| WHT | 66 | 51 | 47 | 72 | 63 | 50 | 76 | 81 | 92 | | |
| BLK | 23 | 31 | 31 | 29 | 39 | 36 | 27 | 52 | 80 | | |
| HSP | 35 | 33 | 20 | 43 | 46 | 47 | 42 | 46 | 83 | | |
| ASN | 70 | 59 | | 85 | 85 | | 60 | | 92 | | |
| MUL | 54 | 43 | | 52 | 61 | | | | | | |
| SWD | 12 | 26 | 29 | 17 | 24 | 22 | 27 | 20 | | | |
| FRL | 29 | 33 | 30 | 33 | 41 | 39 | 33 | 55 | 81 | | |
| ELL | 13 | 33 | 34 | 27 | 35 | 32 | | 40 | | | |

| | 2017 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 |
| WHT | 70 | 54 | 38 | 69 | 47 | 59 | 64 | 74 | 77 | | |
| BLK | 25 | 31 | 28 | 30 | 38 | 36 | 23 | 25 | 52 | | |
| HSP | 35 | 40 | 41 | 41 | 35 | 27 | 30 | 38 | 63 | | |
| ASN | 68 | 61 | | 76 | 66 | | | 92 | 92 | | |
| MUL | 56 | 33 | | 54 | 39 | | | | | | |
| SWD | 9 | 28 | 23 | 10 | 34 | 34 | 3 | 16 | | | |
| FRL | 40 | 39 | 31 | 43 | 41 | 37 | 37 | 44 | 66 | | · |
| ELL | 18 | 46 | 42 | 24 | 37 | 33 | | 29 | | | |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1 Title Standards based instruction in ELA classes ELA data has been trending downward, in or area of need, instructors will need time to be

ELA data has been trending downward, in order to maximize potential in this area of need, instructors will need time to plan with our newly hired Reading coach who will work to ensure planning is in line with state standards.

Intended Outcome

Targeted instruction will help students achieve as a result of additional planning. ELA proficiency will increase from 36% to 46% and ELA learning gains will increase from 37% to 50%

Point Person

Sanjay Brown (sanjay.brown@ocps.net)

Action Step

- 1. ELA teachers will be provided one additional planning day per quarter to plan which will be led by a leadership team member Dr. Wilson (API) and Mrs. Slattery (Reading Coach)
- -An instructional focus calendar will be created for all ELA grade levels Mrs. Slattery (Reading Coach)
- -PLC agendas will be designed and set for consistency by school-leadership Mrs. Slattery (Reading Coach)
- 2. DPLC site team members will facilitate the growth and development of teachers with the understanding of the close reading strategies. (DPLC Site Team)
- -Provide teachers with professional development on close reading strategies.
- -DPLC Site team will review professional learning from previous year to design a PD for all teachers during pre-planning.
- -DPLC site team will meet monthly to conduct walks focused on the DPLC evidence of implementation to inform next steps for building teacher capacity.
- 3. Instructional monitoring, feedback and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational data. (All administrators)

Description

- -Leadership will create a monitoring schedule to provide feedback regarding effective implementation of standards-based instruction. (Dr. Wilson)
- -School-based leadership team members will collaborate to analyze data and tier teachers for targeted coaching support. (Dr. Wilson)
- -Monitor student data weekly with a strategic focus on student subgroups. (Dr. Carr)
- -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) - Dr. Wilson
- 4. School-wide focus on literacy integrated across all disciplines (Mr. Harris) -teachers will receive professional development on integrating reading strategies into all lessons (Dr. Wilson)
- -school-wide use of strategies in small group using gradual release model 5. Integration of vocabulary and literacy strategies learned from Ron Clark Academy professional development (Mr. Harris)
- teachers will receive professional development on embedding vocabulary in lessons
- -use of songs and chants to increase retention of literacy strategies and concepts

Person Responsible

Sanjay Brown (sanjay.brown@ocps.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

- 1. Instructional delivery and student data will be monitored by school leadership Mrs. Slattery (RC) and Dr. Wilson (API)
- 2. Principal and Assistant Principals will visit grade-level common planning sessions weekly. Planning will be monitored to ensure standard based instruction is planning.
- 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 Principal, Assistant Principals and Reading Coach

Description

5. Teachers will be tiered based on class visit data (Tier 1 - proficient teachers, Tier 2 - emerging teachers Tier 3 -teachers needing additional support). Teachers needing additional support will receive weekly walkthroughs with face to face feedback. Tier 2 teachers will receive bi-weekly walkthroughs with face to face feedback and Tier 1 teachers will receive monthly walkthroughs with a face to face feedback. -Principal and Assistant Principals 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. - Reading Coach 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.

Person Responsible

Sanjay Brown (sanjay.brown@ocps.net)

| Activity #2 | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Title | Standards based instruction in Math classes | | | | |
| Rationale | The level of Math proficiency trends below the district and state average and constitutes an area that must be addressed with similar urgency to English Language Arts | | | | |
| Intended Outcome | Targeted instruction will help student achieve as a result of additional planning. Math proficiency will increase from 42% to 50% and Math learning gains will increase from 47% to 55% | | | | |
| Point Person | Sanjay Brown (sanjay.brown@ocps.net) | | | | |
| Action Step | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

- 1. Provide teachers with additional common planning time facilitated by a leadership team member (coach or administration) to build standards-based Math lessons. (Sanjay Brown)
- -Teachers will be provided with four common planning days designed and facilitated by the school-based leadership team. (Sanjay Brown)
- -Teachers will have opportunities for additional paid planning before/after school or on Saturdays based on grade-level needs. (Sanjay Brown) -School-leadership team will design a PLC agenda/facilitator guide for consistency of PLCs in all content areas.
- -Create an instructional focus calendar (IFC) for Math in all grade levels. (Math Coach)
- 2. Instructional monitoring, feedback and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational data.

Description

- -Leadership will create a monitoring schedule to provide feedback regarding effective implementation of standards-based instruction. (Sanjay Brown)
- -School-based leadership team members will collaborate to analyze data and tier teachers for targeted coaching support. (Dr. Carr)
- -Monitor student data weekly with a strategic focus on student subgroups. (Dr. Carr)
- -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) - (Dr. Carr)
- 3. Provide opportunities for students showcase Math applications using projects
- Integration of project based learning in Math to solve real world problems (Sanjay Brown)
- 4. Provision of Saturday and weekly tutoring by certified instructors

Person Responsible

Description

Sanjay Brown (sanjay.brown@ocps.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

- 1. Instructional delivery and student data will be monitored by school leadership Debrah Turner (Math Coach) and Dr. Wilson (API)
- 2. Principal and Assistant Principals will visit grade-level common planning sessions weekly. Planning will be monitored to ensure standard based instruction is planning.
- 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 - Principal, Assistant Principals and Reading Coach
- 5. Teachers will be tiered based on class visit data (Tier 1 proficient teachers, Tier 2 - emerging teachers Tier 3 -teachers needing additional support). Teachers needing additional support will receive weekly walkthroughs with face to face feedback. Tier 2 teachers will receive bi-weekly walkthroughs with face to face feedback and Tier 1 teachers will receive monthly walkthroughs with a face to face feedback. -Principal and Assistant Principals 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. - Math Coach
- 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.

Person Responsible

Sanjay Brown (sanjay.brown@ocps.net)

| Activity #3 | |
|---------------------|---|
| Title | Cultural Responsive interaction with students |
| Rationale | Based on the previous year's discipline data, a disproportionate number of minority students accounted for the majority of discipline infractions |
| Intended Outcome | Reduce the number of written referrals from 1477 to 738 (50% decrease) |
| Point Person | Sanjay Brown (sanjay.brown@ocps.net) |
| Action Step | |
| | Staff members will be trained on new discipline procedures |

Staff members will be trained on new discipline procedures Deans will train review discipline guide with instructors

Description

Students will review OCPS Code of conduct Staff will receive training on school discipline and student demographics

Staff members will take the Harvard Project Implicit test Staff discussion facilitated by principal on Implicit Bias

Person Responsible

Willam Harris (william.harris2@ocps.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Administrators will plan with deans on new discipline procedures - William

Harris, Jr.

Deans will monitor rate of discipline referrals - William Harris, Jr. Description

Administrators will monitor referrals, there source and infractions - William

Harris, Jr.

Person Responsible

Willam Harris (william.harris2@ocps.net)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

Please refer to the College Park Middle School PIP. Our goal is to have 5% of parents attend parental involvement meetings.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

Our Title X- Homeless program 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.

Our SAFE homeless program includes: free backpacks and supplies to our coded students and referred needy kids; community resources for health issues, food, clothing, housing help, and other financial assistance are given to our coded homeless kids and referred needy kids; free food and gift cards at Thanksgiving and Christmas; social worker referrals-clothing, hygiene products for students.

Our SAFE prevention programs include guidance counselors attending training and coordinate school-wide programs and services to prevent violence (Bullying, conflicts, fighting, etc.). Guidance Counselors will implement prevention programs to include: school environment surveys that assess policies/procedures and practices related to violent/ aggressive behavior; writing the school crisis plan; attending and participate in all Threat Assessment meetings; assessing violence prevention curricula and instructional strategies for evidenced-based practices/approaches; assessing violence prevention activities available to students; assessing violence prevention/intervention services provided by school-based staff and community partners;

assessing professional development opportunities available to school staff related to violent/aggressive behavior; assessing involvement of parents/guardians and the community in the violence prevention program;

providing and tracking mental health counseling referrals for students and families; providing community resources to parents for various social/emotional support; assessing suicide prevention programs available to students; assessing bullying prevention programs available to students; implementing Red Ribbon Week drug and alcohol education/ prevention; providing Speakout Hotline information for the students; and providing Think About It counseling program for sexual offenses.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

College Park Middle School has been working closely with its main feeder schools (Lake Silver, Rosemont, Princeton, and Killarney Elementary School) to ensure a smooth transition. The 6th grade guidance counselor, a member of the leadership team, and our International Baccalaureate (IB) coordinator provided opportunities for parents to speak with teachers at the elementary schools. We sent middle school preparedness packets over so that 5th grade teachers could begin to prepare their students for what they would encounter in middle school. Incoming 6th grade students come to College Park MS for a tour and introduction to middle school during a half day event. Incoming 6th grade IB students shadowed a current 6th grade IB student for a day near the end of the school year. Over the summer, we hosted a transition meeting with our feeder school's administration to discuss successful strategies with their outgoing 5th graders. In addition, new IB parents are invited to come for an informational event that covers what to expect as the parent and school expectations as well. During pre-planning, we also host a Meet Your Teacher orientation to welcome all students, provide information, and allow them to explore campus.

For our outgoing students, we work with our main feeder high schools (Edgewater and Jones High School) to identify students who are in need of extra assistance over the summer to try to keep them caught up in reading or math. We also host orientations for the main feeder schools so the students can hear expectations, offerings, and gain school information before they leave the 8th grade. The high school guidance counselors also sit down with our 8th graders and create their desired schedules to help them be successful during their first year in high school.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

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, services, and programs.

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. Our SAFE homeless program includes: Free backpacks and supplies to our coded students only and if any is left over we give out these to our needy students after October.

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 in summer school.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

Academic and career planning is taught through classroom guidance sessions at all grade levels as well as more intensive learning through career exploration classes. Each student schedule reflects the most rigor deemed appropriate by teachers, school counselor and administration based on previous grades, academic test scores and teacher input.

| Part V: Budget | | | | | |
|----------------|--|-------------|--|--|--|
| Total: | | \$16,000.00 | | | |