

Okeechobee County School District

# Osceola Middle School



## 2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>15</b> |

## Osceola Middle School

825 SW 28TH ST, Okeechobee, FL 34974

<http://osceolamiddleschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2017-18 Title I School | 2017-18 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|---|
| Middle School<br>6-8                             | Yes                    | 93%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white<br>on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 46%   |

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Okeechobee County School Board.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

The faculty and staff of Osceola Middle School will provide an engaging, rigorous learning environment that is meaningful to middle school students. We will strive to equip students with the skills needed to be contributing members of a global society in the 21st century.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Exceeding Expectations!

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name             | Title               |
|------------------|---------------------|
| Nielson, Taylor  | Teacher, K-12       |
| Shirley, Alyson  | Instructional Coach |
| Jarriel, Glenda  | Dean                |
| Wise, Harold     | School Counselor    |
| Maggard, Sara    | School Counselor    |
| Downing, Sean    | Principal           |
| Holliday, Meggyn | Teacher, ESE        |
| Worf, Mike       | Teacher, K-12       |
| Potter, Greg     | Assistant Principal |

#### Duties

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

The school leadership team focuses on all school-wide issues and participates in the annual needs assessment. We base our current year's plans off of data collected the previous year and attempt to refine school-wide processes and procedures to improve the overall impact and function of the school. The principal is focused primarily on quality of instruction and is responsible for ensuring the school is meeting lawful and statutory obligations as well as annually monitoring and evaluating employees. The assistant principal assists the principal in monitoring quality of instruction and is charged with overseeing the day-to-day operations of the school including discipline, plant and facility, employee work and supervision schedules and will help provide input to complete annual evaluations of staff. The instructional coach works with classroom teachers as needed to implement PD initiatives and is primarily focused on alignment of formative assessment practices to lesson objectives and standards, while strengthening that practice school wide. Our dean is the point of contact for working with students and teachers when conflicts arise. She is also the person responsible for assisting teachers with intervention design/implementation for MTSS/EWS. Our counselors assist students and families in all areas including scheduling, testing, executing our special populations of students (including ESE and ELL), meeting with teachers to ensure all the needs of kids are met (MTSS/EWS, IEPs, groups, referrals out outside agencies, referrals to food

pantries, etc).

After the needs assessment in the summer where all voices are heard and stakeholders suggest areas for refinement, the leadership team takes on responsibilities based on the talents and interest of the members. During the year, our leadership team meets weekly to update efforts to the topics listed above and all members are given equal voice for decisions that impact the school.

## Early Warning Systems

### Year 2017-18

#### 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 |     |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 33 | 38  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 73  |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 22 | 45  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 85  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 59 | 85  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 176 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 85 | 103 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 276 |       |

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

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |    |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 24 | 38 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 90 |       |

#### 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 | 1 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6  | 4 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |

#### Date this data was collected

Wednesday 8/29/2018

### Year 2016-17 - 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 |     |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 38 | 38  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 98  |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 40 | 34  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 75  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 79 | 111 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 249 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 89 | 97  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 263 |       |

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

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |     |   |    |    |    |     | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |     |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 99 | 112 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 290 |       |

**Year 2016-17 - 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 |     |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 38 | 38  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 98  |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 40 | 34  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 75  |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 79 | 111 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 249 |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 89 | 97  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 263 |       |

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

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |     |   |    |    | Total |     |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-----|---|----|----|-------|-----|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 |       | 12  |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 99 | 112 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 290 |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### Assessment & Analysis

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

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

The ELA Lowest 25th Percentile scored at 39%. The ELA bottom quartile has fluctuated, and is down by 12%. Also, ELA achievement is 41% and science is at 40%. These three components make up the lowest areas.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

The area of greatest decline from the prior the ELA bottom quartile with a 12% decline. This is followed by ELA LG which decreased by 6%. All other components increased from the prior year.

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

The largest gaps are tied between ELA Achievement and Science Achievement with a 12% gap in each. School ELA was 41%, state was 53% and school-level science was 40% and state was 52%. The ELA bottom quartile showed a difference of 8% from the state average of 47%.

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

Math LG increased from 57% to 69% which is a 12% increase. Math achievement increased from 51% to 62%, which is an 11% increase. SS achievement increased by 8%.

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

The implementation of an extended block for math and ELA increased direct instruction for individual students through differentiation.

**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component      | 2018   |          |       | 2017   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 41%    | 40%      | 53%   | 40%    | 40%      | 52%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 47%    | 48%      | 54%   | 53%    | 51%      | 53%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 39%    | 44%      | 47%   | 47%    | 43%      | 45%   |
| Math Achievement            | 62%    | 58%      | 58%   | 57%    | 52%      | 55%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 69%    | 67%      | 57%   | 69%    | 60%      | 55%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 59%    | 54%      | 51%   | 60%    | 51%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         | 40%    | 39%      | 52%   | 41%    | 36%      | 50%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 65%    | 55%      | 72%   | 55%    | 52%      | 67%   |

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |          | Total     |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|----------|-----------|
|                                 | 6                                 | 7       | 8        |           |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 2 (22)                            | 33 (38) | 38 (38)  | 73 (98)   |
| One or more suspensions         | 18 (1)                            | 22 (40) | 45 (34)  | 85 (75)   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 32 (59)                           | 59 (79) | 85 (111) | 176 (249) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 88 (77)                           | 85 (89) | 103 (97) | 276 (263) |

**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                    | 2018 | 44%    | 41%      | 3%                         | 52%   | -8%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 39%    | 37%      | 2%                         | 52%   | -13%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2018 | 33%    | 32%      | 1%                         | 51%   | -18%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 35%    | 36%      | -1%                        | 52%   | -17%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -6%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2018 | 41%    | 40%      | 1%                         | 58%   | -17%                    |

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                       | 2017 | 47%    | 46%      | 1%                         | 55%   | -8%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -6%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                    | 2018 | 66%    | 56%      | 10%                        | 52%   | 14%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 50%    | 44%      | 6%                         | 51%   | -1%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 16%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2018 | 43%    | 46%      | -3%                        | 54%   | -11%                    |
|                       | 2017 | 42%    | 37%      | 5%                         | 53%   | -11%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2018 | 67%    | 54%      | 13%                        | 45%   | 22%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 43%    | 39%      | 4%                         | 46%   | -3%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 24%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 25%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08                | 2018 | 40%    | 37%      | 3%                         | 50%   | -10%                    |
|                   | 2017 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2017        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| CIVICS EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018        | 62%    | 50%      | 12%                   | 71%   | -9%                |
| 2017        | 57%    | 52%      | 5%                    | 69%   | -12%               |
| Compare     |        | 5%       |                       |       |                    |



| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2017         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018         | 100%   | 54%      | 46%                   | 62%   | 38%                |
| 2017         | 91%    | 46%      | 45%                   | 60%   | 31%                |
| Compare      |        | 9%       |                       |       |                    |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018         | 100%   | 44%      | 56%                   | 56%   | 44%                |
| 2017         | 100%   | 37%      | 63%                   | 53%   | 47%                |
| Compare      |        | 0%       |                       |       |                    |

## Subgroup Data

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 14       | 28     | 28          | 33        | 52      | 49           | 13       | 40      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 23       | 40     | 41          | 50        | 62      | 62           | 12       | 68      |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 24       | 41     | 42          | 50        | 69      | 62           | 14       | 43      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 39       | 48     | 37          | 62        | 67      | 57           | 36       | 67      | 67        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 25       | 47     |             | 56        | 44      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 45       | 48     | 40          | 65        | 72      | 60           | 48       | 64      | 61        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 36       | 46     | 41          | 60        | 67      | 58           | 38       | 62      | 59        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 16       | 41     | 40          | 18        | 40      | 38           | 7        | 34      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 19       | 53     | 57          | 38        | 37      | 40           |          | 58      |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 26       | 37     | 38          | 27        | 33      | 17           |          | 45      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 36       | 59     | 52          | 48        | 53      | 52           | 28       | 56      | 67        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 46       | 48     |             | 43        | 67      | 70           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 44       | 51     | 54          | 56        | 62      | 63           | 43       | 60      | 65        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 35       | 51     | 50          | 46        | 55      | 54           | 31       | 56      | 60        |                   |                     |

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

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

#### Areas of Focus:

##### Activity #1

**Title** Student Support

**Rationale** To meet the needs of the whole child. Student needs are varied beyond academics. Learning gains, attendance, crisis calls, suspension rates, student responses to climate survey indicators are all data sources that show a need for changes to current school practice.

**Intended Outcome** The students responding favorably to the climate indicator related to having one trusted adult will increase.  
The percentage of students with 21+ absences will decrease.  
The percentage of students with learning gains in ELA will increase.  
The number of student crises at OMS will decrease.

**Point Person** Greg Potter (gregory.potter@okee.k12.fl.us)

##### Action Step

**Description** 1. Improve process of MTSS (provided interventions)  
2. Implement a tutorial program to provided intensive intervention in the area of reading.  
3. Conduct PD related to Culturally Responsive Teaching.  
4. Conduct more frequent Tier 1 PBIS rewards to engage students.

**Person Responsible** Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)

##### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

**Description** Student progress on MTSS will be reviewed every two weeks (starting September 2018).  
Student progress in reading intervention class will be progress monitored every six weeks.  
Student surveys related to PBIS will be conducted quarterly.  
Absences, attendance, discipline indicators will be reviewed weekly by OMS Admin and monthly by Advisory Teams (Team Leaders, SAC, PBIS, etc.) as appropriate.

**Person Responsible** Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)

| Activity #2                   |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Title</b>                  | Communication  |
| <b>Rationale</b>              | OMS Leadership team conducted a needs assessment at the conclusion of the 17-18 school year. Communication was identified as the top area of need among the parents, faculty and staff.  |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>       | Improved communication and awareness of parents, staff and students around pertinent information.  |
| <b>Point Person</b>           | Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)   |
| Action Step                   |  |
| <b>Description</b>            | <p>Faculty meetings (regularly) to improve teacher to leadership communication.</p> <p>Conduct Parental Involvement Activities around goal setting and a sixth grade orientation.</p> <p>Implement surveys.</p> <p>Design a survey to gauge effectiveness of communication.</p> <p>Send weekly newsletters to faculty, staff, students, parents.</p> <p>Purchase newsletter program (S'more) in order to engage stakeholders and monitor analytics.</p> <p>Set up REMIND Account to share information with parents.</p> <p>Use feedback surveys frequently with students, parents and staff for a variety of purposes.</p> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | [no one identified]  |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness |  |
| <b>Description</b>            | <p>Regularly (at least quarterly) surveys to teachers and staff to gauge effectiveness of communication.</p> <p>Regularly provide short surveys to parents for a variety of purposes.</p>  |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)   |

| Activity #3                   |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Title</b>                  | ELA Proficiency  |
| <b>Rationale</b>              | Our overall ELA achievement is 12% lower than the state average. We have a flat trend for 5 consecutive years in ELA. Less than 50% of our students have scored proficient in the last 7 years. Our ELA LG decreased by 6% from the prior year and our ELA bottom quartile decreased by 12% from the prior year. |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>       | Increase the percentage of students scoring proficient in Reading to 50%.  |
| <b>Point Person</b>           | Alyson Shirley (alyson.shirley@okee.k12.fl.us)   |
| Action Step                   |  |
| <b>Description</b>            | Conduct goal setting as a school, department, grade level, teacher level and student level to establish proficiency targets.<br>Conduct Data Chats every 6 weeks to ensure that progress is made towards goals.  |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Alyson Shirley (alyson.shirley@okee.k12.fl.us)   |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness |  |
| <b>Description</b>            | Data Chats<br>Progress Monitoring/Interim Assessments (three times a year)<br>Reading Intervention Data (every six weeks)<br>FSA Testing/Results   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Alyson Shirley (alyson.shirley@okee.k12.fl.us)   |
| Activity #4                   |  |
| <b>Title</b>                  | Science Proficiency  |
| <b>Rationale</b>              | Science data indicates a difference of 12% between the school and state averages. Science achievement has consistently fallen below 50% over the past few years.   |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>       | Increase the percentage of students scoring proficient in Science to 50%.  |
| <b>Point Person</b>           | Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)   |
| Action Step                   |  |
| <b>Description</b>            | Conduct goal setting as a school, department, grade level, teacher level and student level to establish proficiency targets.<br>Conduct Data Chats every 6 weeks to ensure that progress is made towards goals.  |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)   |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness |  |
| <b>Description</b>            | Data Chats<br>Progress Monitoring/Interim Assessments (three times a year)<br>FSSA Testing/Results   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)   |

| Activity #5                   |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Title</b>                  | Math Proficiency  |
| <b>Rationale</b>              | We increased our overall math proficiency from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018. Despite this increase, we still want to have more students overall scoring proficient than we had in previous years.   |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>       | Seventy percent of students will score proficient in 2018-2019.   |
| <b>Point Person</b>           | Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)  |
| Action Step                   |   |
| <b>Description</b>            | Conduct goal setting as a school, department, grade level, teacher level and student level to establish proficiency targets.<br>Conduct Data Chats every 6 weeks to ensure that progress is made towards goals.<br>Attend weekly collaborative planning sessions with teachers. |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)  |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness |   |
| <b>Description</b>            | Data Chats<br>Progress Monitoring/Interim Assessments (three times a year)<br>FSA Testing/Results   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | [no one identified]   |

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

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

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

OMS Faculty and Staff recognize the need to foster positive relationships with parents. To this end, we will host a sixth grade parent night prior to the start of the school year to engage parents in positive home/school connections. We also will host a goal setting night to solicit input for the school improvement plan to ensure that goals are in line with parent aims and to attempt to provide parents with greater input into the way the school operates. We also plan to utilize surveys more frequently (weekly as a part of our outreach/newsletters; at the conclusion of each Title 1 Event).

#### PFEP Link

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

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

The administration, faculty and staff of Osceola Middle School is committed to working with our students and one another in order to create a sense of community, where we celebrate the individual and we create classroom and school environments that are inclusive and welcoming. Community and family are discussed daily between the announcements, communication with stakeholders and when we make decisions throughout the day.

The social-emotional needs of our students are met through our ESE services, private counseling agencies, guidance personnel, teachers, and administrators. Each student's needs are different, and the appropriate intervention is made by those listed above. Our MTSS/EWS is the primary process used to determine the specific need and the level of support needed.

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

OMS Guidance will host the fifth graders to attend a campus visit in the spring of the school year. Students are able to hear from members of the administrative team and to walk the campus (parents and fifth grade teachers are also invited to attend).

OMS eighth graders have had opportunities in the past to visit the Okeechobee Freshman Campus for a campus tour and for Ninth Grade Parent Nights in the spring of the coming year. Additionally, school administrative teams for the two schools have met in the past to assist with scheduling, collaboration including student data and MTSS/EWS discussions.

OMS Eighth Graders participate in a Reality and Career Fair (held on the OMS Campus) hosted by our local state college (Indian River State College). Reality Fair allows students to participate in a version of the game of "Life." Students are assigned a salary based on grade-point average. Students select a career based on their salary range. Students take a "chance" and wind up with children, and must provide for transportation (buying a car), a place to live (buy a house), expenses like insurance, taxes, etc. IRSC also runs a concurrent Career Fair based on the different career clusters offered on IRSC Main Campus.

This year, OMS would like to participate in CTE events which bring OMS eighth graders to Okeechobee High School to provide exposure and boost recruitment in district CTE program.

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

As a part of the needs assessment process, the leadership team and other key stakeholders review data, share noticings and wonderings, analyze problems and use theories of action to revise and improve school-wide processes and procedures (Leading for Instructional Improvement: How Successful Leaders Develop Teaching and Learning Expertise, Fink and Markholt, 2011). Using these habits for thinking, we have revamped our master schedule to take advantage of common, grade-alike planning periods for classroom teachers. We provide course remediation and reading intervention to students with low proficiency rates (MTSS/EWS) and have strategically selected programs and staff to work with the students with the greatest level of needs. Based on reviews of the frequency/duration of intervention/effectiveness of PD, we make decisions to improve the impact in order to decide which interventions to continue and which to replace.

\*We have rewritten scopes and sequences and revised our master schedule for extended instructional time for ELA and Math instruction (96 minutes per subject per day). As part of these extended class periods, all teachers are delivering differentiated, small group instruction in ELA and math in order to

better meet individual student needs. PD and collaborative planning are happening as frequently as appropriate, and the Academic Coach is going in to provide side-by-side coaching. The Leadership Team and Instructional Leadership Team are conducting fidelity checks of implementation weekly.

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

OMS Eighth Graders participate in a Reality and Career Fair (held on the local IRSC campus) hosted by our local state college (Indian River State College). Reality Fair allows students to participate in a version of the game of "Life." Students are assigned a salary based on grade-point average. Students select a career based on their salary range. Students take a "chance" and wind up with children, and must provide for transportation (buying a car), a place to live (buy a house), expenses like insurance, taxes, etc. IRSC also runs a concurrent Career Fair based on the different career clusters offered on IRSC Main Campus.

This year, OMS would like to participate in CTE events which bring OMS eighth graders to Okeechobee High School to provide exposure and boost recruitment in district CTE program.

### Part V: Budget

Total:

\$4,000.00