Oak Grove Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Oak Grove Middle School

1370 S BELCHER RD, Clearwater, FL 33764

http://www.oakgrove-ms.pinellas.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Kristy Therrien

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]

* 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 Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide an equitable learning experience for all students and prepare all students for high school, college, career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

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
Therrien, Kristy	Principal	
Oleksy, Mariah	Assistant Principal	
Wolford, Christopher	Assistant Principal	
Mallory, Karen	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/9/2020, Kristy Therrien

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.*
1

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.*
14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
48

Total number of students enrolled at the school
969

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
13

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	293	317	355	0	0	0	0	965
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	10	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	63	79	0	0	0	0	194
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	66	68	0	0	0	0	179
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	26	61	50	0	0	0	0	137

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	7	12	13	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 6/28/2021

2020-21 - 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	331	362	396	0	0	0	0	1089
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	34	38	0	0	0	0	121
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	26	61	50	0	0	0	0	137

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	11	17	9	0	0	0	0	37
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5

2020-21 - 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	331	362	396	0	0	0	0	1089
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	34	38	0	0	0	0	121
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	26	61	50	0	0	0	0	137

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	11	17	9	0	0	0	0	37
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	37%			38%	52%	54%	36%	50%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	42%			47%	55%	54%	43%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%			42%	47%	47%	38%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	41%			43%	55%	58%	47%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	41%			47%	52%	57%	52%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%			40%	46%	51%	45%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	46%			43%	51%	51%	51%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	56%			60%	68%	72%	52%	65%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	36%	51%	-15%	54%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	41%	51%	-10%	52%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
08	2021					
	2019	37%	55%	-18%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	33%	44%	-11%	55%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	51%	60%	-9%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
08	2021					
	2019	30%	31%	-1%	46%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	42%	51%	-9%	48%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	61%	68%	-7%	71%	-10%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	70%	55%	15%	61%	9%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	56%	-56%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Content area cycle assessments were used to collect and compile this data.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48/20%	51/20%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/3%	2/2%	
	English Language Learners	10/14%	12/15%	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56/23%	55/23%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/4%	2/2%	
	English Language Learners	11/15%	8/13%	

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	61/22%	41/14%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	
	English Language Learners	8/10%	4/5%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	131/38%	137/40%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	9/3%	8/2%	
	English Language Learners	27/8%	33/10%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	78/62%	100/69%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/25%	0	
	English Language Learners	9/64%	12/67%	

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	86/26%	209/58%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/11%	11/30%	
	English Language Learners	6/9%	28/41%	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	159/41%	185/47%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	9/2%	9/2%	
	English Language Learners	5/1%	11/3%	
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5/8%	8/9%	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0	3/12%	
	English Language Learners	2/72/5%		

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	8	22	22	11	30	31	14	32			
ELL	22	36	38	30	36	42	21	42	50		
ASN	61	61		83	72						
BLK	24	31	18	26	37	34	23	54	69		
HSP	29	39	39	36	38	37	36	49	65		
MUL	52	56		44	38		53	69	64		
WHT	47	46	44	49	45	38	59	60	76		
FRL	32	38	34	37	39	34	37	50	66		
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	13	36	32	16	33	31	28	20	36		
ELL	18	39	40	29	36	32	19	37	35		

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	71	50		79	62						
BLK	29	44	48	26	40	46	34	42	53		
HSP	30	44	40	37	42	35	35	49	54		
MUL	46	50		53	54		80	54	64		
WHT	47	49	45	52	53	44	48	76	56		
FRL	32	44	41	38	42	34	38	50	50		
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	9	35	33	15	36	32	12	42			
ELL	12	35	35	25	39	45	14	32			
ASN	53	44		71	44						
BLK	22	36	38	29	45	45	32	40	60		
HSP	29	42	35	41	50	48	47	45	71		
MUL	33	42		57	50		37	86	50		
WHT	47	46	44	55	56	44	60	60	56		
FRL	30	40	36	42	49	47	45	47	58		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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	36
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	69
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	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
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	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	51
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	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Our Students with disabilities and our ELL scholars are not showing proficiency in core content areas based on cycle assessments.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our 6th and 7th grade ELA proficiency is below 21% and 6th grade math is below 23%.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

We had a virtual teacher on FMLA for 6th grade ELA and the other 6th grade ELA teacher was out with COVID and then FMLA.
Our 6th grade math teacher was virtual the first semester.
We need consistent face to face teachers in the classroom.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our 7th grade Civics data showed a 9% increase.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Experienced teachers focused on Civics standards. We scheduled our L25 scholars into World History to provide an additional year of support prior to taking the Civics EOC.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Standards based instruction that meets the depth and breadth of the standard. Consistent teaching and support in the classrooms. Our SWD and EL scholars need increased support in classrooms.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Our ESE teachers and co-teachers will take part in the SDI training. Instruction will be monitored daily and support provided as needed.
Continued content specific trainings (20 and outs) on standards and lesson planning.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Data will be analyzed closely based on specific instructors. Professional development and coaching cycles will be implemented as needed.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	An inclusive, supportive classroom environment is an essential condition for learning. Engagement and achievement thrive in a classroom culture where student's assets, interests, experiences, perspectives and cultural knowledge are valued and intentionally reflected in curriculum materials and learning experiences.
Measureable Outcome:	Scholars with more than 90% absenteeism will decrease by 15% Scholars with extreme tardies will decrease by 15% Scholars receiving discipline referrals and reconnects will decrease by 15%.
Monitoring:	We will analyze our data every week during our leadership team meetings. Support and/or professional development will be given as needed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Provide timely and relevant Professional development for cultural responsiveness and equity. - Engage families in meaningful ways that enhance their knowledge and skill. -Plan for and implement culturally responsive instruction into lesson plans and daily activities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	- Research supports teacher knowledge and efficacy as a key determinant of learning outcomes for scholars. The most effective professional development is sustained and designed to support self-reflection and knowledge informed changes in practice. -Authentic partnerships with parents/families is correlated with higher rates of attendance, better classroom grades, lower disciplinary infractions, and higher test scores. -In order to engage scholars and accelerate their learning, it is essential to provide asset-based instruction that builds their self-efficacy, critical thinking and reasoning while making meaningful connections to their lives.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement culture building and restorative circles 2 days a week and social-emotional learning (3 days a week) during our extended 2nd period.

Person Responsible	Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Have 100% of instructional staff complete AVID CRT Training and implement strategies daily.

Person Responsible	Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Have 100% of our instructional staff complete restorative practices training and implement learned practices.

Person Responsible	Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Utilize the Culturally responsive Teaching PLC templates to ensure equitable practices in lesson plans and instructional activities.

Person Responsible	Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Equitable grading cohort
Grading for Equity Book Study and quarterly equitable grading cohort PD. .

Person Responsible Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Engagement is a critical element of the learning process, however without an emphasis on alignment of the standards to the implementation of the instruction, the output from the engagement will not improve the forward progress of the school towards meeting learning goals. it is critical to incorporate alignment to the standards as a driving force for planned instructional engagement across all core content areas as scholars navigate learning through a collaborative teaming structure. The scholars in each subgroup must have access to aligned,. grade level standards both in the core learning environment and while engaging in intervention groups across the many departments that service the varying needs of our population. When teacher are prepared for instructional implementation after carefully incorporating best practices for instructional strategies using aligned curriculum developed in PLCs, the scholars are more likely t engage in rigorous lessons that deepen their understanding of the standards. Ultimately, this results in an increase in the level of learning. When scholars are engaged in aligned lessons., they are more readily able to incorporate collaborative team talk, comprehend standards based tasks and retain the level of learning necessary to make gains and achieve proficiency. When student services, admin, teachers and family work together to identify and support the individual learning needs of scholars without decreasing or modifying alignment, learning increases. As the strength in teacher knowledge of aligned lessons grows, effective and creative teaching strategies strengthen and engagement and learning also increase.
Measureable Outcome:	As measured by our 2021 test results: Science will increase by 10%- from 46% to 56%. Proficiency in ELA will increase by 7% from 37-44%. Learning gains in ELA will increase by 8% from 42-50% Proficiency in Math will increase by 8% from 41 to 49% and learning gains in math will increase by 9% from 37 to 46%. Our ESSA data for our Black, ELL and SWD scholars will increase to 41% for each subgroup.
Monitoring:	We will analyze data weekly at our leadership team meetings. Support and additional focus will provided to teachers as needed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Planning for implementation of Florida Standards and crosswalk with BEST standards. Implementation of district provided curriculum in Math, ELA, Science and Social Studies with supplemental materials as needed and decided by teacher. Differentiating instruction based on specific readiness.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Scholars must have access to the rigor in the standards. Use of District provided resources provide materials to teach to the breadth of the standard and meet the needs of all learners. Scholars grow when they are given support in their areas of need.

Action Steps to Implement

Ongoing monitoring of classroom instruction with actionable feedback through the use of a standard rigor walkthrough form to ensure instructional implementation with fidelity of the strategies and the district core curriculum will occur daily.

Person Responsible Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Instructional coaches will provide feedback, coaching and daily support in both ELA and Math. Sharing out weekly during our ILT to use the groups knowledge to plan for focused support.

Person Responsible Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Administrative participation in bi-weekly PLCs to ensure standards based lesson planning using the CRT template and CPalms.

Person Responsible Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Monthly professional development provided by instructional coaches and Administrators through 20 and outs. Focus on engagement strategies and standard development to include BEST standards.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Utilize small group instruction to engage scaffold and differentiate based on scholar needs (formal and informal data)

Person Responsible Christopher Wolford (wolfordc@pcsb.org)

Celebrate scholar academic successes

Person Responsible Mariah Oleksy (oleksym@pcsb.org)

Teachers and scholars utilize a common board configuration to ensure standards focus with specific learning goal. Use of rubrics/scales to monitor scholar progression toward mastery.

Person Responsible Christopher Wolford (wolfordc@pcsb.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our EL population continues to grow. Training in effective engagement and instructional strategies to instruct our EL scholars.
Measureable Outcome:	Our ELL scholars will show growth in proficiency in ELA moving from 22-36 proficient.
Monitoring:	Ongoing observation with actionable feedback.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will understand each scholars language proficiency level and length of time in the United States. Teachers will plan for and deliver lessons that meet the needs of these scholars. Bilingual Assistants will provide support in ELA classes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our ELL scholars need ongoing support as they learn to read, write and speak in English.

Action Steps to Implement

ESOL, ELA and Reading teachers will collaborate weekly during common planning to co-plan lessons that will bridge grade-level work and the integration of language development within content specific instruction.

Person Responsible	Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

We will schedule our Bilingual Associates into classes where EL scholars are clustered based on their Access Points for EL data.

Person Responsible	Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

Plan for meaningful communication with families via the website, parent letters, phone calls and closed captioned online events. Utilize Lion Bridge interpretation phone services.

Person Responsible	Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Our ESOL coordinator and APC will monitor fidelity of implementation of all policies for EL, LY and LF scholars. (EL Grading Policy)

Person Responsible	Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

The bilingual Associates will will monitor the LF Scholar performance to ensure academic success to provide appropriate supports in their reading classes.

Person Responsible	Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Students with Disabilities showed decreases in proficiency since 2018. Strategic scheduling and increased academic planning/support provided by VE Teachers will lead to an increase in proficiency.
Measureable Outcome:	Our SWD subgroup will show gains in ELA Achievement, Math Achievement and Learning Gains. They will increase from % 8 proficient to at least 20% in ELA and 11% to 20% in math proficiency.
Monitoring:	Ongoing observation with actionable feedback. Data analysis during weekly Leadership team meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mariah Oleksy (oleksym@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Co-Teaching with delivery of specially designed instruction. The VE teacher will differentiate the instruction based on the needs of the student with the disability.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our VE teachers need increased ownership in the success of these scholars.

Action Steps to Implement

Train the whole faculty of ESE processes and procedures including staffing, small group instruction, accommodations, and overall ESE needs and services.

Person Responsible	Mariah Oleksy (oleksym@pcsb.org)

Ongoing progress monitoring of all scholars through formal and informal data collections. VE Teachers will gauge the level of progression through the data tracker and plan accommodations based on specific need.

Person Responsible	Mariah Oleksy (oleksym@pcsb.org)

Teachers in the co-teach model will attend SDI, training, Monthly ESE meetings, data collection, Quality IEPs, Implementation of small groups within content area classrooms to provide an equitable learning experience for all scholars and prepare all scholars for high school, college, career, and life.

Person Responsible	Mariah Oleksy (oleksym@pcsb.org)

Ongoing observations of effective instruction to include SDI and ongoing feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible	Mariah Oleksy (oleksym@pcsb.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Culturally responsive instruction and relationship building supports academic success for all scholars. Our black scholars need equitable opportunities for success in all classrooms.
Measureable Outcome:	Our black scholars will increase their learning gains in ELA from 31% to 40% and increase math proficiency from 26% to 36% as measured by the ELA and Math FSA.
Monitoring:	Ongoing data analysis during weekly leadership meetings. Daily walkthroughs with actionable feedback.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement AVID Culturally Responsive Strategies in all instructional courses.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We need to provide access to success for all scholars. We must provide both behavioral and academic support and resources as appropriate. Having relationship with mentors will help to engage the scholars in the curriculum and improve their ability to access higher educational experiences.

Action Steps to Implement

Schedule scholars into advanced and accelerated courses and provide scaffolded support in order to provide them with rigorous instruction and opportunities for high school credit courses and advancement.

Person Responsible	Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

Identify students in need of academic support and provide a mentor to support those students.

Person Responsible	Christopher Wolford (wolfordc@pcsb.org)

Teachers will engage scholars in culturally relevant instruction and implement the six M's. (music, movement, mouth, meaning, meaning, models, monitoring for feedback) during planning and instruction.

Person Responsible	Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Teachers will plan engaging lessons that intervene and monitor with feedback.

Person Responsible	Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We have an increased number of scholars needing Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports due to varying reasons ranging from mental health issues to behavior and academic needs.
Measureable Outcome:	We will reduce our percentage of students at risk for Tier 2 and Tier 3 support by 10% as measured by intervention data.
Monitoring:	Bi-weekly MTSS meetings with Administrative presence and weekly leadership team meetings to discuss our progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement a Multi-Tiered System of Supports that includes data- based problem solving, data evaluation, building capacity/infrastructure for implementation, leadership development, and clear communication/collaboration of a three tiered instructional model. This system of supports encompasses academics, behavior, and social emotional learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	National Association of School Psychologists, Leveraging essential school practices, Every Student Succeeds Act, and Multi-tiered System of Supports practice model: A crosswalk to help every school and student succeed is essential to the growth of our scholars.

Action Steps to Implement

MTSS team will meet biweekly to define and monitor the data collection processes, student progress towards academic and behavioral goals, track and modify interventions implementation, and create action steps for subsequent meetings.

Person Responsible	Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Design a system for academic and behavior data collection and analysis for Tier 2 and Tier 3.

Person Responsible	Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Present and gain faculty support and buy-in through continued intensive training and collaboration

Person Responsible	Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Continue to train on equitable practices and restorative practices throughout the school year.

Person Responsible	Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Possible areas of concern are our number of scholars being removed from class for in school suspension. We will monitor our behavior implementation plan to minimize scholar time out of class. We will utilize our PBIS rewards to monitor minor infractions, reward scholars frequently. We will analyze data from our reconnect process to ensure scholars are given opportunities to be reintegrated in the classroom.

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.

We revamped our school wide behavior plan to ensure equity for all scholars. Our goal is to build relationships with our scholars and give them a sense of belonging. We will utilize a flow chart to ensure scholars are given opportunities to be successful and be redirected prior to earning a consequence or being removed from a class. We have purchased the PBIS Rewards system to ensure scholars are being rewarded consistently and infractions are monitored. We are using our SBLT to problem solve and our MTSS teams to provided needed interventions to ensure the success of our scholars. We implement Social Emotional Lessons school wide each day during 2nd period.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Our Learning lab is made up of Oak Grove parents, teachers, staff and scholars. Our Behavior Coach, Administrative Team and Staff developer for School Climate will monitor the effectiveness and implementation of our school wide behavior plan.