

Orange County Public Schools

Maitland 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	22

Maitland Middle

701 N THISTLE LN, Maitland, FL 32751

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

Demographics

Principal: Andrew Leftakis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2016

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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 engaging and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising a 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
Leftakis, Andrew	Principal	Principal - Andrew Leftakis: Oversees all aspects of the school and communicates with all stakeholders to ensure shared decision-making. Oversees the reading, science, resource staff, and the performing arts department.
Bloom, David	Other	Staffing Specialist - David Bloom: Oversees the ESE department, Support Facilitation model, Gifted Services model and Learning Strategies courses. Monitors ESE students. Works with teachers in the identification and monitoring of Gifted learners. Monitors students in the Top 30% and those assigned to high school credit classes. Coordinates with the Media Specialist to monitor MTSS Referrals and the Achievement Gap.
Singer, Randon	Guidance Counselor	Guidance Counselor - Randon Singer: Provides counseling services and creates student schedules for students in sixth grade and seventh graders with last names starting with letters A through L. Monitoring of attendance, grades and assessments of assigned students. Coordinates with the Media Specialist to monitor MTSS Referrals and ensure proper class placement. Meets with teachers and parents to write and monitor 504 Plans.
Kendall, Danielle	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Instruction - Mrs. Danielle Kendall: Oversees the math, social studies, guidance, and ESE departments, as well as course recovery. Responsible for the master schedule and works with guidance to ensure appropriate course offerings.
Orseno, Amy	Instructional Media	Instructional Coach - Amy Orseno: Responsible for all aspects of student testing. Provides professional development and supports teachers and administrators in their Deliberate Practice. Serves as the school's testing coordinator. Assists teachers in the development of common formative assessments. Also serves as an instructional coach for math and science.
Ziegler, Floyd Clark	Teacher, K-12	PASS Coordinator - Mr. Ziegler: Responsible for investigations into acts of

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>bullying and the after school tutoring program. Monitors discipline data by subgroup and frequency. Coordinates mentoring programs with outside agencies and serves as the teacher in charge of the PASS classroom as needed.</p>
<p>Rauls, Cherrie</p>	<p>Teacher, K-12</p>	<p>Student Support - SAFE Coordinator - Cherrie Rauls: Responsible for coordinating counseling services for students, working with students in crisis, and coordinating services for families. Additionally, this individual work work with our PASS program to implement restorative justice practices and sit on our Threat Assessment Team.</p>
<p>Brockmeier, Brittany</p>	<p>Instructional Coach</p>	<p>Instructional Coach/Reading Coach - Brittany Brockmeier: Monitors the identification of students in the Bottom 30% in Reading schoolwide. Works with the Testing Teacher to provide Professional Development and supports teachers and administrators in their Deliberate Practice. Monitors student attendance. Leads the Reading department PLC and monitors student data and implementation of Research-based intervention programs. Additionally, Ms. Brockmeier is responsible for ELL student monitoring.</p>
<p>Thomas, Carla</p>	<p>Dean</p>	<p>Student Support - Carla Thomas: Responsible for monitoring of all discipline data by subgroup and frequency. Works closely with all members of the Leadership Team to ensure the safety of students on campus. Part of the threat assessment team and coordinates MTSS services.</p>
<p>Delaney, Kelly</p>	<p>Instructional Media</p>	<p>Media Specialist - Kelly Delaney: Responsible for integration of digital resources. Works with teachers across the curriculum to provide technology resources. Also serves as textbook manager and co-coordinates Partners in Education with the STEM Coordinator and ADDitions with the School Secretary. Works with Compact to secure mentors and spearheads Learning for Life initiative.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Higgs, Crystal	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal - Ms. Crystal Higgs: Oversees the ELA, electives, and physical education departments. Ms. Higgs is also responsible for school operations, one to one initiative, and discipline.
Himschoot, Brian	Dean	Brian Himschoot is responsible for monitoring discipline data, school-wide policies and procedures, code of conduct of the review, and is a member of the threat assessment team, and school behavior team.
Yergey, Louise	Guidance Counselor	Guidance Counselor - Louise Yergey: Provides counseling services and creates student schedules for students in seventh grade and eighth graders with last names starting with letters M - Z. Monitoring of attendance, grades and assessments of assigned students. Coordinates with MTSS team to monitor MTSS Referrals and ensure proper class placement. Meets with teachers and parents to write and monitor 504 Plans.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/11/2016, Andrew Leftakis

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.*

4

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

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Demographic Data

<p>2020-21 Status (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Active</p>
<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Middle School 6-8</p>

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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	256	264	258	0	0	0	0	778
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	22	19	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	35	39	0	0	0	0	75
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	24	60	0	0	0	0	100
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	35	39	0	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	30	41	0	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	29	46	0	0	0	0	108

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	27	50	63	0	0	0	0	140

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 7/13/2020

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	278	270	258	0	0	0	0	806
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	27	26	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	39	44	0	0	0	0	131
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	51	37	0	0	0	0	129
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	69	48	0	0	0	0	186

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	46	52	37	0	0	0	0	135

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	278	270	258	0	0	0	0	806
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	27	26	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	39	44	0	0	0	0	131
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	51	37	0	0	0	0	129
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	69	48	0	0	0	0	186

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	46	52	37	0	0	0	0	135

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

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	66%	52%	54%	63%	52%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	52%	54%	54%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	45%	47%	37%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	66%	55%	58%	68%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	63%	55%	57%	61%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	50%	51%	50%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	67%	51%	51%	62%	49%	50%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	80%	67%	72%	75%	67%	70%

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	62%	52%	10%	54%	8%
	2018	59%	48%	11%	52%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	58%	48%	10%	52%	6%
	2018	59%	48%	11%	51%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	70%	54%	16%	56%	14%
	2018	66%	55%	11%	58%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	48%	43%	5%	55%	-7%
	2018	52%	35%	17%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	59%	49%	10%	54%	5%
	2018	49%	51%	-2%	54%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	49%	36%	13%	46%	3%
	2018	52%	32%	20%	45%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	66%	49%	17%	48%	18%
	2018	56%	49%	7%	50%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
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	78%	66%	12%	71%	7%
2018	79%	66%	13%	71%	8%
Compare		-1%			

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	93%	63%	30%	61%	32%
2018	81%	61%	20%	62%	19%
Compare		12%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%
2018	99%	65%	34%	56%	43%
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	25	37	28	24	32	24	13	55			
ELL	40	55	50	45	54	44	31	57	82		

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	65	67		85	72		82	92	87		
BLK	33	44	43	31	39	32	36	54	71		
HSP	54	55	48	53	55	43	52	63	90		
MUL	70	45		84	68		58		100		
WHT	82	62	52	83	74	75	83	94	94		
FRL	44	49	45	45	49	41	47	62	84		
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
SWD	17	30	26	22	32	24	15	22			
ELL	41	43	39	43	45	43	40	70			
ASN	78	59		86	71				86		
BLK	32	43	43	30	42	35	24	61	66		
HSP	48	44	39	51	48	34	42	69	81		
MUL	62	42		67	59			82	73		
WHT	81	65	49	81	65	60	74	92	85		
FRL	43	46	41	41	45	38	36	67	67		
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
SWD	17	31	24	19	34	30	22	35			
ELL	29	61	58	39	58	50	20	40			
ASN	93	86		87	79		82		88		
BLK	30	37	25	35	46	42	21	49	71		
HSP	53	50	43	59	59	53	51	68	79		
MUL	70	50		74	72						
WHT	76	61	50	82	66	61	79	87	82		
FRL	38	40	31	46	54	44	34	53	76		

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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	646
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	79
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	43
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	58
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	71
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
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	78
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	52
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.

Based on available data, the data component that showed the lowest performance was overall math achievement as determined by iReady performance data. According to the middle of year assessment, only 42% of students were considered proficient as compared to 66% who were proficient on the 2018-19 FSA. Contributing factors were continued learning gaps and lack of prior knowledge, and disruption to instruction due to teacher change. Math has continued to trend above 60% on state assessments so this iReady data may be an outlier compared with achievement data over the course of the last three years.

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

Based on available data, the data component that showed the greatest decline was overall math achievement as determined by iReady performance data. According to the middle of the year assessment, only 42% of students were considered proficient as compared to 66% who were proficient on the 2018-19 FSA. Contributing factors were continued learning gaps, lack of prior knowledge, and disruption to instruction due to teacher change. Math has continued to trend above 60% on state assessments so this iReady data may be an outlier compared with achievement data over the course of the last three years.

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.

State comparison data is currently not available, but based on trend data, Maitland continues to lag behind the state in the ELA lowest 25% learning gains category with a typical gap of 3 to 5%. Contributing factors continue to be the prior reading ability of students, which requires a great deal of remediation, and support, to improve overall ability level. We have recently shifted to a new instructional model and teachers continue to grow in the use of rotations and small group instruction.

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

Algebra 1 showed the most improvement from the previous year, increasing 3 points based on PMA data when compared with prior year EOC data; moving from 92% to 95%. This can be attributed to an increased focus on standards-based instruction, professional development regarding high yield strategies, and frequent monitoring by administration including data meetings, classroom sweeps, and feedback.

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

Based on the early warning indicators, an area of concern is ELA course failures. The number of course failures in ELA is 100 with the highest number of students in one category being eighth-grade students. This is especially a concern because there is a 64% gap between ESE students and white students (ESSA focus) in ELA and a 49 point gap between black and white students in ELA.

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

1. Close the achievement gap between ESE and white students in ELA (ESSA focus), which is a 64% gap when using prior year testing data.
2. Close the achievement gap between black and white students, in ELA, which is a 49 point gap
3. Improve achievement data in ELA and math lowest 25% learning gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Improve teacher capacity - ELA, Math, Science, Civics Proficiency - Accelerate Student Performance

Measureable Outcome: By improving teacher capacity, we anticipate student achievement and engagement to increase. Additionally, we anticipate ELA proficiency to improve by 3%, moving from 66% to 69%; Math proficiency to improve by 3%, moving from 66% to 69%; science proficiency to improve by 3%, moving from 67% to 70%; and civics proficiency to improve by 3%, moving from 80% to 83% - as measured by FSA and EOC exams.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Andrew Leftakis (andrew.leftakis@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Create a system of continuous feedback for classroom teachers. This 'sweep' system would require instructional coaches and administrators to sweep through every content classroom, everyday, and provide actionable feedback based on observation or instructional practices and student tasks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By providing continuous feedback to teachers, ineffective or non-standards based lessons can be corrected immediately, teachers will be provided with actionable feedback on a daily/weekly basis, and coaching opportunities will be presented to support individual teacher growth.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1). Develop PD calendar during the summer
- 2). Identify teacher leaders who can assist in monitoring of systems and deliver PD
- 3). Restructure Instructional Leadership Team who will monitor instructional systems, conduct classroom sweeps, provide feedback
- 4). Develop meeting schedule - admin team meets every Friday and instructional leadership team meets twice a month on Wednesday. Purpose is to review structures, monitor student achievement via formative assessments, and to plan shifts in instruction and operations. Additionally, these meetings allow coaches and administrators to discuss sweep observations, teacher needs, and coaching opportunities, as well as calibrate feedback.
- 5). PD, which may include formative assessment creation, blended classroom strategies, and engagement strategies.
- 6). Provide on-going, professional development based on classroom walkthrough data and teacher feedback.
- 7). Create a daily sweep schedule to observe classroom instruction and monitor that the schedule is being followed on a daily/weekly basis and weekly actionable feedback

Person Responsible Amy Orseno (amy.orseno@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Utilize close read strategies across content areas - ELA Proficiency - Accelerate Student Performance and Close Achievement Gaps. A significant body of research links the close reading of complex text, whether the student is a developing or advanced reader, to significant gains in reading proficiency and finds close reading to be a key component of college and career readiness.

Measureable Outcome: By utilizing close read strategies across content areas, students will be able to interact with complex text on a daily basis, and as a result, ELA proficiency will increase by 3%, moving from 66% the previous year, to 69% for the 2019-20 school year as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment. Additionally, by using close read strategies with ESE learners, we hope to improve in this category from 17% proficiency to 41% proficiency (ESSA area of focus).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Danielle Kendall (danielle.kendall@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The use of close read strategies across content areas, which utilize grade level appropriate text, academic conversations, and text dependent questions in an effort to help students adequately process the information.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: A significant body of research links the close reading of complex text, whether the student is a developing or advanced reader, to significant gains in reading proficiency and finds close reading to be a key component of college and career readiness. The resources used to make this determination is 'Text Dependent Questions; Pathways to Close and Critical Reading' by Fisher and Frey. Additionally, 'Academic Conversations' by Zwiers and Crawford.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1). Identify school based teacher leadership team who will champion this strategy
- 2). Review successes and areas for growth from the previous school year
- 3). Develop team/school specific goals centered around close read strategies
- 4). Identify model classrooms
- 5). Develop system to open up classroom practice utilizing technology in order to sign up during planning periods.
- 6). Based on county provided training, provide teachers with monthly updates in order to improve practice, which may include training on how to select complex text, effective lesson planning, and structure close read activities.
- 7). Utilize classroom sweeps in order to identify areas of success and continued areas of growth, and provide actionable feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible Brittany Brockmeier (brittany.brockmeier@ocps.net)

#3. 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 the subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: overall discipline referrals, stakeholder perception of the school, school attendance, and observed student interactions.

Measureable Outcome: By building a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students, we hope to see a reduction of disrespect, bullying, and harassment referrals (188 total for the 2019-20 school year) for the 2020-21 school year. Additionally, we hope to see an increase in our school improvement survey results, specifically in the category of 'In my school, the building and grounds are safe, clean, and provide a healthy place for learning', which saw 19% of respondents say 'no'.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Andrew Leftakis (andrew.leftakis@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. 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) Understand how social and emotional learning is connected to instructional strategies
- 2) Establish a common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning at your school with adults and students
- 3) Use a process to examine the current school climate and culture
- 4) Determine relevant strategies to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration across the school
- 5) Implement strategies for social and emotional learning with adults and students to positively impact school climate and culture
- 6) Understand the connections between social and emotional learning and instructional

strategies

7) Use cycles of professional learning that integrate academics and social and emotional learning

8) Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts

Person Responsible Andrew Leftakis (andrew.leftakis@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will continually address school safety and external stakeholder feedback through leadership meetings, campus observations, SAC/PTA meetings, and parent input surveys.

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.

Maitland Middle School strives to build a positive school culture for all stakeholders. This is achieved by constantly reviewing the available data, which includes survey results, referral data, and school observations. Maitland has implemented a number of social-emotional learning programs over the last few years including the Challenge Day program, Week of Tolerance, and partnership with Advent Health to implement the Leadership Development program through PE classes. Additionally, parent, student, and teacher feedback is collected and analyzed in order to identify trends and make shifts in daily practice. This is accomplished via SAC and PTA meetings as well as school improvement surveys. At times, special focus groups are called to discuss specific concerns that have taken place on campus or impacted certain student groups. Finally, Maitland partners with the Winter Park Health Foundation to help support social, emotional, and physical health in our stakeholders.

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: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3610	140-Substitute Teachers	0731 - Maitland Middle	General Fund	821.0	\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: Provide substitute teachers so teachers can observe other classrooms or attend professional development.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3610	140-Substitute Teachers	0731 - Maitland Middle	General Fund	65.0	\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: Provide substitute teachers so teachers can observe other classrooms or attend professional development.</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
					Total:	\$3,000.00