

Orange County Public Schools
Liberty Middle



**2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement
Plan**

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Liberty Middle

3405 S CHICKASAW TRL, Orlando, FL 32829

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

Demographics

Principal: Lovely Tinsley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/18/2018

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 (50%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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

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

Provide the school's vision statement

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

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
Tinsley, Lovely	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.
Ruby, Darcy	Instructional Coach	Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk;” assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
Schwartz, Andrew	Assistant Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.
Speights, Donnell	Instructional Coach	Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk;” assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
O'Harrow, Alicia	Dean	

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rosswick, Terry	Dean	<p>Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk;” assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.</p>
Woody, Jannan	Dean	<p>Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk;” assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.</p>
Villaverde, Nicole	Assistant Principal	<p>Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.</p>
Moss, Kristine	Instructional Coach	<p>Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk;” assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	-------	---------------------------------

delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/18/2018, Lovely Tinsley

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

69

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 (50%) 2017-18: C (48%)

	2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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	358	405	396	0	0	0	0	1159
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	69	103	0	0	0	0	255
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	49	51	0	0	0	0	107
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	27	83	0	0	0	0	160
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	47	79	0	0	0	0	171
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	91	83	0	0	0	0	229
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	102	89	0	0	0	0	255

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	82	118	135	0	0	0	0	335

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	5	5	1	0	0	0	0	11

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/7/2020

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	424	399	386	0	0	0	0	1209
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	103	112	0	0	0	0	283
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	78	69	0	0	0	0	190
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	134	145	0	0	0	0	315
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	207	169	0	0	0	0	514

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	61	155	156	0	0	0	0	372

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	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	8

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	424	399	386	0	0	0	0	1209
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	103	112	0	0	0	0	283
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	78	69	0	0	0	0	190
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	134	145	0	0	0	0	315
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	207	169	0	0	0	0	514

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	61	155	156	0	0	0	0	372

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	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	8

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	47%	52%	54%	44%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	52%	54%	46%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	45%	47%	38%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	45%	55%	58%	41%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	49%	55%	57%	45%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	50%	51%	33%	44%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	51%	51%	42%	51%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	58%	67%	72%	64%	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	46%	52%	-6%	54%	-8%
	2018	37%	48%	-11%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	34%	48%	-14%	52%	-18%
	2018	33%	48%	-15%	51%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
	2018	48%	55%	-7%	58%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	37%	43%	-6%	55%	-18%
	2018	29%	35%	-6%	52%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	40%	49%	-9%	54%	-14%
	2018	35%	51%	-16%	54%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
08	2019	15%	36%	-21%	46%	-31%
	2018	15%	32%	-17%	45%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	36%	49%	-13%	48%	-12%
	2018	38%	49%	-11%	50%	-12%
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	55%	66%	-11%	71%	-16%
2018	57%	66%	-9%	71%	-14%
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	74%	63%	11%	61%	13%
2018	73%	61%	12%	62%	11%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	53%	39%	57%	35%
2018	78%	65%	13%	56%	22%
Compare		14%			

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	22	38	34	21	43	42	19	27			
ELL	26	42	37	29	42	46	21	40	77		
ASN	76	65		76	73						
BLK	42	40	25	38	42	50	28	43	70		
HSP	41	48	38	40	47	45	32	57	77		
WHT	68	55	40	65	55	68	67	69	82		
FRL	42	48	39	40	45	46	33	55	73		

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	16	38	34	16	33	23	20	38			
ELL	19	38	35	19	31	26	20	35	65		
ASN	72	53		72	61						
BLK	36	50	53	36	40	65	32	63	74		
HSP	39	44	37	35	41	31	36	59	72		

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
MUL				70							
WHT	68	54	38	67	64	29	72	82	90		
FRL	39	44	37	36	42	32	38	59	73		

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	49
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	39
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	489
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	73
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	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Black/African American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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 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	63
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

ELA lowest 25th percentile performed the lowest with 38% which remained the same from the previous year. Science Achievement followed closely with 39% which was a drop from 42% in 2018.

For grade level data, 8th grade math showed the lowest performance with 15% of students showing proficiency on the FSA Math Test for two years in a row. Students need more independent practice at the level and rigor of the standard. More small group instruction would also benefit struggling students.

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

Social Studies showed the greatest decline with 58% which was a drop of six percentage points. Seventh grade reading showed a decline with a loss of 2%. The largest factor that contributed to this decline was a loss of a classroom teacher and reading coach during the first semester of the 2018-19 SY which may have negatively impacted Civics scores.

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

Social Studies not only showed the greatest decline it also had the greatest gap of 14 percentage points when compared to the state. As mentioned earlier, seventh grade reading showed a decline due to a loss of a classroom teacher and a reading coach which may have negatively impacted Civics EOCs.

For grade level data, 8th grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average with a 31% difference. The trend has been that our 8th grade math is our lowest performing area for the last three years. A contributing factor is the reduction in the number of students who are part of this group due to accelerated courses such as Algebra I and Geometry. Students need more independent practice at the level and rigor of the standard. More small group instruction would also benefit struggling students.

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

Math lowest 25th percentile showed the most improvement by increasing 14 percentage points to 47% in 2019.

For grade level data, 6th grade reading showed the most improvement with a 9% gain. Intensive reading and ELA were combined for a double block of continuous instruction. Certified and degreed math tutors were strategically placed in specific classrooms of need. The Math Coach worked closely with tutors and math teachers identifying and assisting the lowest 25%.

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

Attendance is an area of concern with more than 20% of students across all three grade level that had an attendance lower than 90%.

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

1. Increase ELA Achievement by 3%, from 47% to 50%
2. Increase Science Achievement by 6%, from 39% to 45%
3. Increase SWD proficiency by 10%, from 31% to 41%
4. ELL proficiency increase by 10%, from 39% to 49%
5. Increase 8th grade math proficiency by 10%, from 15% to 25%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Description: Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students.
 Rationale: 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. Teachers assign students to homogeneous and heterogeneous groups based on explicit learning goals, monitor peer interactions, and provide positive and corrective feedback to support productive learning.
 2. Teachers require collaboration, issue directives that promote productive and autonomous group interactions, and embed strategies that maximize learning opportunities and equalize participation.

Measureable Outcome:

- * Character Lab Academic Engagement Snapshot: Academic engagement will improve from 3.5 to 3.8.
- * Improve students with less than 90% attendance in 8th grade from "112" to less than 90 students.
- * On FSA, decrease the achievement gap between subgroups by at least 3%.
- * Cognia survey data from students will show a 3% increase in the overall average score when compared to the previous year's overall average score.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lovely Tinsley (lovely.tinsley@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.

Evidence-based Strategy:

Description of Monitoring: 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:

Rationale for Strategy Selection: 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

- Understand how social and emotional learning is connected to instructional strategies
- Establish a common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning at your school with adults and students
- Use a process to examine the current school climate and culture

Person Responsible Raquel Vasquez (raquel.vasquez@ocps.net)

- Implement strategies for social and emotional learning with adults and students to positively impact school climate and culture
- Use cycles of professional learning that integrate academics and social and emotional learning
- Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts

Person Responsible Raquel Vasquez (raquel.vasquez@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Liberty will build up our system of how we analyze instructional practice by analyzing data and making the necessary adjustments that improve student outcomes.
 RATIONALE: Students in 8th grade Math and our SWD and ELL ESSA categories are not showing sufficient proficiency from year to year. The school needs to build a system that will allow us to accelerate the growth of the students in these areas so that students can catch up and the school outcomes can increase at a quicker rate.

Measureable Outcome: 8th grade FSA Math proficiency, SWD proficiency, and ELL proficiency will increase at least 10%. Overall math proficiency will increase three percentage points from 45% to 48%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Donnell Speights (donnell.speights@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: After teachers develop instructional goals, they evaluate and make ongoing adjustments to students’ instructional programs. Once instruction and other supports are designed and implemented, teachers have the skills to manage and engage in ongoing data collection using curriculum-based measures, informal classroom assessments, observations of student academic performance and behavior, self-assessment of classroom instruction, and discussions with key stakeholders (i.e., students, families, other professionals). Teachers study their practice to improve student learning, validate reasoned hypotheses about salient instructional features and enhance instructional decision making. Effective teachers retain, reuse and extend practices that improve student learning and adjust or discard those that do not.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The 8th grade Math data and our SWD and ELL ESSA categories are not showing sufficient proficiency from year to year. Using Common Assessments and District assessments (PMAs, i-Ready) will track the effectiveness of these strategies and determine adjustments that may need to be made.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Invite Calculus Project Students to start the summer before 7th grade. (June 2-June 25, 2020, Speights)
2. Create and keep a running record of PLC agendas and planning minutes to be utilized by the PLC members and Instructional Coach assigned. (August 17, 2020, weekly, Ruby,Speights,Moss)
3. Classroom instruction will focus on teaching the standards at grade-level (August 10, 2020, weekly monitor, Administration and Instructional Coaches)
4. Instructional Coach and teachers will review data from common and district assessments to adjust instruction. (Sept 8, 2020, monthly, Ruby,Speights,Moss)
5. Collaborate with data-proven schools to gain strategies. (Sept 8, 2020, bi-monthly, Tinsley)
6. Provide professional development for teachers when areas of need arise. (August 26, 2020, monthly, Tinsley)

Person Responsible Lovely Tinsley (lovely.tinsley@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Other areas of focus will be included in our system of analysis for instructional practices and adjustments. School-wide we will also use the small group strategies which increase the outcomes of all students and areas of focus.

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.

Liberty hired a 12 month Parent and Family Engagement Coordinator to work directly with families. The Parent and Family Engagement Coordinator will be responsible for conducting home visits, delivering parent workshops, gathering and presenting detailed data pertaining to parent engagement activities, attending and communicating with parent/school leadership councils, establishing communication with all parents, and creating engagement opportunities for all parents. The goal is to establish and improve effective communication between home and school, improve parent and family outreach, and facilitate training opportunities for parents and families of students in grades 6th through 12th that will positively impact student academic performance. Employees in this classification identify and encourage parents to participate in school and district family engagement activities, provide support to staff and parents on best practices in parent engagement, and provide guidelines for school-based parent engagement projects.

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				\$79,882.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	2110	100-Salaries	1551 - Liberty Middle	General Fund		\$74,882.00

			<i>Notes: Classroom Teachers will meet for common planning at least once a week during the contracted day. The master schedule will be constructed to allow this common planning time.</i>			
	6400		1551 - Liberty Middle	Title, I Part A		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: For the purchase of materials to support professional learning activities.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning				\$7,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	140-Substitute Teachers	1551 - Liberty Middle	General Fund		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: For the purchase of substitutes for attending and conducting professional development.</i>			
	1142		1551 - Liberty Middle	School Improvement Funds		\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: For the purchase of supplies to support student learning activities. Supplies to include incentives for students demonstrating growth on common assessments.</i>			
					Total:	\$86,882.00