

Orange County Public Schools

Robinswood Middle



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

Robinswood Middle

6305 BALBOA DR, Orlando, FL 32818

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

Demographics

Principal: Nicole Jefferson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2016

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)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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

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

Provide the school's vision statement

Vision: To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

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
Jefferson, Nicole	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social-Emotional • SAFE • Discipline • Deans • Principal Secretary • Bookkeeper • TSR • Academic Coaches • Grade Level Clerks • School DPLC Team • MTSS Discipline • PASS • SEL
Johnson, Shawnette	Dean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8th grade Dean • Classroom walk-throughs • CHAMPS • AM / PM Duty • Course Recovery • Athletic Director • MTSS Discipline
Kress, Lisa	Instructional Media	<p>Media Center Laptop Check in and out Inventory Technology assistance</p>
Brown, Kristi	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master Schedule • Guidance • 504's • ELA • Reading • Science • Guidance/504's • Front Office Clerks • Accountability/Corrections • SAC/PTSA • Substitutes • MTSS Academics • Title 9 • Support Testing Coordinator • Athletics • School DPLC Team • Other Duties As Assigned
Roper, Sean	Dean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7th grade Dean • AM/PM Duty • Chess Club

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom Walk-throughs • CHAMPS • MTSS Discipline
Cerkiewicz, Breanne	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MTSS – Academics-Discipline • Staff Development-Points • Academic Calendar • New Teacher Program • Title I • Classroom walk-throughs • DPLC Team • CHAMPS • School Newsletter
Gainey, Avis	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civics Coach • PD for Testing • Testing Coordinator • Performance Matters/Unify • Classroom Walk-throughs • Data Chats • MTSS Academics
Garcia-Fidler, Diana	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behavior Specialists • Track ESE Data • CHAMPS • MTSS Behavior
Rainey, Sean	Teacher, K-12	Civics Lead
Mutters, Nicole	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math • Social Studies • Electives • MYP-IB • ESOL/Paras • ESE/Paras • Clubs & Organizations • Fundraisers • Summer School & ESY • MTSS Discipline • Digital Administrator • Attendance • School Improvement Plan • Field Trips • Textbooks • School DPLC Team • Others Duties as Assigned

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bond, Bridgett	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staffing specialist • IEP Meetings • FSAA Testing • Certify • ESY Summer School • PD ESE Staff • School Based DPLC Team • MTSS Academics • MTSS Discipline
Fenn, Julia	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCT • CELLA Testing • Certify • ESOL Paras • ESOL PD • School Based DPLC Team • MTSS Academics • MTSS Discipline
Hall, Loretta	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science Coach • Performance Matters • Targeted PD • Data chats • Tutoring Program • School based DPLC Team • Classroom Support/Walk-throughs • MTSS Academics
Mack, Taylirre	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELA Coach • Tutoring Program • Performance Matters/Unify • Classroom Support/Walk-throughs • Data Chats • Targeted PD for ELA • DPLC Team • MTSS Academics

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/1/2016, Nicole Jefferson

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.*

2

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

71

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 Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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	454	419	375	0	0	0	0	1248
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	57	58	0	0	0	0	185
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	95	98	0	0	0	0	226
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	6	18	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	6	7	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	114	117	0	0	0	0	362
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	149	142	159	0	0	0	0	450

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	133	125	139	0	0	0	0	397

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/20/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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	470	380	418	0	0	0	0	1268
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	82	55	0	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	145	134	0	0	0	0	381
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	5	19	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	214	250	211	0	0	0	0	675

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	106	140	113	0	0	0	0	359

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	2	0	0	0	0	26

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	35%	52%	54%	33%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	52%	54%	45%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	45%	47%	41%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	31%	55%	58%	27%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	42%	55%	57%	36%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	50%	51%	36%	44%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	51%	51%	35%	51%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	65%	67%	72%	65%	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	32%	52%	-20%	54%	-22%
	2018	29%	48%	-19%	52%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	30%	48%	-18%	52%	-22%
	2018	30%	48%	-18%	51%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	37%	54%	-17%	56%	-19%
	2018	35%	55%	-20%	58%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	24%	43%	-19%	55%	-31%
	2018	12%	35%	-23%	52%	-40%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	26%	49%	-23%	54%	-28%
	2018	25%	51%	-26%	54%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
08	2019	16%	36%	-20%	46%	-30%
	2018	9%	32%	-23%	45%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	37%	49%	-12%	48%	-11%
	2018	32%	49%	-17%	50%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	61%	66%	-5%	71%	-10%
2018	63%	66%	-3%	71%	-8%
Compare		-2%			

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

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	63%	12%	61%	14%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	76%	61%	15%	62%	14%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	53%	26%	57%	22%
2018	78%	65%	13%	56%	22%
Compare		1%			

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	16	37	41	19	45	42	18	32			
ELL	23	43	40	22	39	37	21	47	85		
ASN	56	53		72	65						
BLK	35	45	40	30	41	41	39	66	75		
HSP	30	43	26	30	45	40	29	50	75		
WHT	43	38		48	48			82			
FRL	35	44	39	30	41	42	38	63	76		

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	29	25	10	24	30	9	38			
ELL	13	40	43	14	28	23	23	63	69		
ASN	48	39		57	57		67		82		
BLK	33	46	44	25	35	35	33	68	72		
HSP	29	36	32	28	40	36	29	57	87		
WHT	25	45		35	35						
FRL	33	45	42	27	36	36	34	66	74		

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	44

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	456
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	62
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	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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	52
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	46
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 data components that showed the lowest performance were eighth grade math showing sixteen percent of the students being proficient. Also, students with disabilities in the area of english language arts (ELA) showing 16% of the subgroup being proficient. Eighth grade math scores did have significant gains increasing 7% points from the previous year, despite this significant growth, eighth grade was one of the schools' lowest data components. Factors that contributed to the low performance was not implementing the instructional framework with fidelity. Students with disabilities in the area of ELA showed an increase of 4% points, however SWD was one of the schools' lowest data components. A factor contributing to the low performance was the lack of structured interventions targeted specifically for this subgroup.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was English Language Learners (ELL) in the area of Civics. The previous year (2018) 63% of the students in this subgroup

achieved proficiency. For the (2019) school year this particular subgroup reflected 47% of the students achieving proficiency in Civics. The data showed a 16% decline. A major factor contributing to the decline in proficiency was the teachers' limited understanding of ELL strategies and implementing them with fidelity to support the instruction.

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

Sixth grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The state average for sixth grade math is 55% and the school's average is 24%, presenting a gap of 31%. Teachers had challenges in implementing the instructional framework for math, which included the rotational model. The rotational model incorporates strategies that address deficient skills but still allows the teacher to teach the core content.

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

The data component showing the most improvement is sixth-grade math. Sixth grade math made a significant increase; in 2018 going from 12% proficient to 24% proficient in 2019.

Whole group instruction focused on standards based instruction was one actionable step we implemented which showed to produce a large increase in proficiency.

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

The EWS data reflects two major areas of concern:

1. Student scoring a Level 1 on the ELA and/or Math statewide assessment is 812.
2. Students receiving one or more suspensions is 226.

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

1. Decreasing the achievement gaps related to out ESSA subgroups (ELL & SWD)
2. Increasing learning gains in the Lowest 25%.
3. Decrease the overall number of students receiving one or more suspensions.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The ELL and SWD subgroups are scoring below the Federal Index of 41%. This is the second consecutive year SWD has not met the Federal Index average score; with 31% overall proficient. 2019 marks the first year ELL students have scored below the Federal Index average; with 40% overall proficient.

Measureable Outcome: The plan is to increase the overall proficiency of the ELL and SWD subgroups by 10%. By accomplishing this goal both subgroups will meet or exceed the Federal Index Average of 41%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Nicole Mutters (nicole.mutters@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiated Instruction and Differentiated Intervention Support Structures. These strategies will be monitored through classroom observations and by progress monitoring data (PMA, Culminating Task, i-Ready).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiated instructional strategies can be implemented through all the core classes; ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies as well as tutoring, Learning Strategies and Reading. The implementation of these strategies will help to strengthen and support Tier I core instruction and support and enhance Tier II & III instruction that mainly focuses on interventions needed to address academic needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Individual student data will be disaggregated by ELA strands to create a differentiated instructional plan.

Person Responsible Taylirre Mack (taylirre.mack@ocps.net)

2. Group the students' appropriately for scheduling. Schedule in core and intensive classes as needed.

Person Responsible Kristi Brown (kristi.brown@ocps.net)

3. Teacher and leadership team members will meet throughout the year to analyze data, align intervention resources and plan for corresponding instruction. Leadership team members will monitor for fidelity of implementation by conducting classroom observations.

Person Responsible Breanne Cerkiewicz (breanne.cerkiewicz@ocps.net)

4. Progress monitoring students' knowledge using ongoing assessments such as culminating task, PMA, and i-Ready. Teachers will use this data to make adjustments in instruction.

Person Responsible Breanne Cerkiewicz (breanne.cerkiewicz@ocps.net)

5. Increase academic support through Learning Strategies classes with a push in tutor

Person Responsible Bridgett Bond (bridgett.bond@ocps.net)

6. Implement differentiated rotations in ELA classes with ELL students to target deficiencies

Person Responsible Taylirre Mack (taylirre.mack@ocps.net)

7. Provide teachers with professional development on the use of ELL strategies to use within ELA classes. The professional development will be ongoing based on need determined by observations, data and walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Julia Fenn (julia.fenn@ocps.net)

#2. 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 address the following school needs: 1. Student scoring a Level 1 on the ELA and/or Math statewide assessment is 812. 2. Students receiving one or more suspensions is 226.

Measureable Outcome: Improvement in Early Warning Systems indicator data, student overall achievement should go from 812 level 1's on ELA and Math to 600, and students receiving one or more suspensions should decrease from 226 to 150.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Nicole Jefferson (nicole.jefferson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: 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.

Resources/Criteria: 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

1. Establish a committee/site team to research and understand SEL in connection with instructional strategies.

Person Responsible Nicole Jefferson (nicole.jefferson@ocps.net)

2. The Team will determine goals for integration of SEL including launching and modeling the program.

Person Responsible Nicole Jefferson (nicole.jefferson@ocps.net)

3. Establish a common language including talking stems to be implemented across campus.

Person Responsible Nicole Jefferson (nicole.jefferson@ocps.net)

4. Conduct a climate and culture survey to be completed in the beginning, middle, and end of the year.

Person Responsible Breanne Cerkiewicz (breanne.cerkiewicz@ocps.net)

5. Place an emphasis on team and collaboration, using the House System and restorative practices.

Person Responsible Shawnette Johnson (shawnette.johnson@ocps.net)

6. Using Peace Corners and the Calm Room as strategies to connect SEL and instructional practices.

Person Responsible Nathalie Viau (nathalie.viau@ocps.net)

7. Using announcements to complete daily and weekly SEL tips and strategies as a conversation starter.

Person Responsible Nathalie Viau (nathalie.viau@ocps.net)

8. Monitor the implementation of SEL strategies through the coaching cycle, walkthroughs, and EWS and discipline data periodically throughout the year.

Person Responsible Nicole Jefferson (nicole.jefferson@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

In addition to ESSA subgroups and SEL the leadership team will place a focus on learning gains in the bottom 25% of the students in ELA and Math. Through progress monitoring, disaggregation of data, and a focus on differentiated instruction, we will work to close the learning gaps for each individual student.

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.

Through monthly SAC and the redevelopment of PTSA, stakeholders will be informed about the school processes, highlights and have their input included on school improvements.

Magnet nights, 6th grade orientation, Meet the Teacher, Open House are hosted to create a positive school environment and include parents and the community in the school culture.

Archer day of service, the PEL, and the Pine Hills beautification department are a few examples of the focus on community and service reflecting the pride in our community with a focus on giving back.

Our partners in ED create a direct line from our stakeholders to the staff and students creating a positive school and community culture.

The House system, student academic celebrations, including the Archer Night of Excellence, as well as the Archer Award, creates a positive school environment while focusing on academics, collaboration, and teamwork.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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