

School District of Osceola County, FL

Kissimmee Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Kissimmee Middle School

2410 DYER BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Eugenia Rolando

Start Date for this Principal: 1/7/2019

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Osceola 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Kissimmee Middle School

2410 DYER BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	96%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola 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.

Inspiring all students to reach their highest potential as responsible, productive citizens

Provide the school's vision statement.

All Students will achieve at high levels.

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
Rolando, Eugenia	Principal	Dr. Rolando's duties are to create safe, student-centered, physical and digital learning environments that maximize student academic achievement and socio-emotional well-being. Student accelerated learning is a priority. Dr. Rolando facilitates a leadership team that works collaboratively and deliberately to ensure equity, close the achievement gap among student subgroups, and fulfill the vision that all students achieve at high levels at Kissimmee Middle School. As an instructional leader, Dr. Rolando evaluates teacher effectiveness together with the Assistant Principals.
Mabra, Jane	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Mabra is responsible for building the master schedule for face-to-face and distance-learning students, and facilitates the stocktake process through which the school monitors the effectiveness of the action steps taken to accomplish the school improvement plan. As an instructional leader, Mrs. Mabra evaluates teacher effectiveness together with the Principal and other Assistant Principal.
McKenney, Sarah	Instructional Coach	MTSS Coach, coordinates the school efforts to ensure the leadership team, together with teachers, design and implement adequate action steps to achieve the school goals, including academics, discipline, and attendance. Mrs. McKenney is also an instructional mentor for new teachers working towards increasing teacher effectiveness and retention.
Franceschi, Frankie	Assistant Principal	Mr. Franceschi is responsible for leading the school operations, safety, discipline, and state assessment. As an instructional leader, Mr. Franceschi evaluates teacher effectiveness together with the Principal and other Assistant Principal.
Hirschauer, Amanda	Instructional Coach	As a Math Coach, Mrs. Hirschauer assist math teachers with curriculum, lesson planning, and student assessment. Mrs. Hirschauer is also an instructional mentor for new teachers working towards increasing teacher effectiveness and retention.
Ordiales, Kari	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Ordiales supports Literacy schoolwide and coordinates efforts among English Language Arts, Intensive Reading, Research, and English Language Development teachers. Mrs. Ordiales is also an instructional mentor for new teachers working towards increasing teacher effectiveness and retention.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 1/7/2019, Eugenia Rolando

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.*

22

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.*

80

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

102

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	483	460	415	0	0	0	0	1358
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	5	4	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	60	65	0	0	0	0	151
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	7	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	22	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	129	108	0	0	0	0	375
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	143	107	0	0	0	0	381

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	28	0	0	0	0	51

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	3	5	7	0	0	0	0	15

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/8/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	107	120	0	0	0	0	333
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	5	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	31	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	152	127	0	0	0	0	423

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	35	40	52	0	0	0	0	127

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	2	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	5

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	106	107	120	0	0	0	0	0	333
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	31	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	144	152	127	0	0	0	0	0	423

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	35	40	52	0	0	0	0	127

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	5

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	37%	45%	54%	36%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	48%	54%	46%	51%	54%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	42%	47%	37%	39%	44%
Math Achievement	41%	49%	58%	42%	48%	56%
Math Learning Gains	52%	51%	57%	58%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	47%	51%	57%	49%	50%
Science Achievement	39%	47%	51%	42%	51%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	72%	72%	72%	76%	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	31%	48%	-17%	54%	-23%
	2018	31%	46%	-15%	52%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	30%	47%	-17%	52%	-22%
	2018	29%	46%	-17%	51%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	30%	49%	-19%	56%	-26%
	2018	34%	52%	-18%	58%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	28%	45%	-17%	55%	-27%
	2018	31%	43%	-12%	52%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	20%	30%	-10%	54%	-34%
	2018	16%	29%	-13%	54%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	38%	47%	-9%	46%	-8%
	2018	38%	43%	-5%	45%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	30%	42%	-12%	48%	-18%
	2018	32%	42%	-10%	50%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	62%	33%	67%	28%
2018	100%	68%	32%	65%	35%
Compare		-5%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	73%	-9%	71%	-7%
2018	65%	70%	-5%	71%	-6%
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	88%	49%	39%	61%	27%
2018	90%	52%	38%	62%	28%
Compare		-2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	44%	56%	57%	43%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	94%	39%	55%	56%	38%
Compare		6%			

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	28	42	35	32	52	49	16	41			
ELL	25	43	45	29	53	60	22	59	81		
ASN	72	47		67	59						
BLK	40	48	43	39	45	39	43	65	95		
HSP	34	45	49	41	53	58	38	70	86		
MUL	29	33		23	21						
WHT	46	51	44	46	53	64	38	72	88		
FRL	33	43	44	38	51	56	34	69	88		
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	23	42	40	24	43	39	16	32			
ELL	20	49	48	29	47	49	23	64	60		
ASN	58	63		58	63						
BLK	37	41	33	38	43	45	38	74	69		
HSP	37	50	49	41	49	52	38	75	71		
MUL	46	50		46	73						
WHT	52	55	67	55	49	53	61	74	83		
FRL	37	48	51	41	49	54	36	71	81		
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	7	26	24	12	49	51	13	57			
ELL	16	39	37	25	55	56	22	55	75		
ASN	43	60		61	75		70				
BLK	41	48	32	42	64	71	46	77	93		
HSP	34	44	37	40	57	56	40	70	89		
MUL	41	38		25	73						
WHT	41	59	48	51	59	47	47	78	90		
FRL	35	46	38	40	57	56	41	69	88		

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	519
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	61
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	51
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	52

Hispanic Students	
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	27
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	56
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	50
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.

Students with disabilities and multiracial students. Students with disabilities may not have received rigorous instruction on strategies to perform on grade level.

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

Learning gains in Language Arts and Social Studies performance decreased by 4% each. Both tests are dependent on literacy skills.

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.

Science achievement data 39% had the greatest gap when compared to the state average of 51%. Literacy skills are a huge component in this assessment, which showed a decline as well.

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

Middle school acceleration showed the most improvement, 17%, from 71% to 88%. We placed all students in Algebra and did not remove those who were struggling but rather provided them with additional support, remediation, and involved parents.

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

The number of students who failed a prior course in Math is a concern, as it affects not only math learning gains and achievement, but also acceleration. Attendance and out of school suspensions are areas that also affect student academic performance.

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

1. improve academic performance in English Language Arts
2. improve academic performance in math skills
3. improve academic performance in science
4. improve academic performance of multiracial students and students with disabilities
5. address students' social emotional learning needs
6. develop a school-wide post secondary culture for all students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Academic performance in English Language Arts is an area of focus because reading proficiency affects the ability to excel in many other academic areas. Data from 2018-2019 reveal KMS students' reading proficiency (37%) is well below the state average (54%). While KMS serves a large population of English Language Learners, learning gains (46%) were also below state average (54%).

Measurable Outcome: KMS cannot afford to set unambitious goals. KMS plans to meet the state average ELA learning gains (54%) and increase proficiency by at least 5%. KMS will also embrace the district goal of accelerating learning and ensuring all students make at least 1.5 years worth of growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Eugenia Rolando (eugenia.rolando@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The ELA team has several new teachers, while experienced, many do not have the background in the Marzano's instructional framework. Teachers will learn the Marzano Framework while adopting acceleration strategies. The Principal will form a Literacy Leadership Team, which will engage in ongoing inquiry, in collaboration with Professional Learning Communities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Marzano's comprehensive instructional framework encompasses research-based standards-based planning, standards-based instruction, and conditions for learning, all of which are conducive to maximizing learning. The framework is founded on teacher collaboration in Professional Learning Communities. Acceleration strategies are meant to resist remediation of unfinished learning and avoid the cycle of low quality below-grade level work.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1- Teachers will engage in effective, ongoing professional learning of the Marzano framework.
- 2- Teachers will work in highly effective Professional Learning Communities who engage in genuine collective inquiry to improve instruction and maximize learning.
- 2- Teachers and Literacy Leadership Team will use relevant timely student data to analyze students' academic needs or unfinished learning and differentiate instruction (universal screener NWEA).
- 3- Teachers will use Curriculum Unit Plans developed by the district (a collaborative effort of experts from different schools) to provide instruction in essential grade level skills and standards.
- 4- Teachers will intentionally plan high-interest lessons and provide "just in time" scaffolds for students to deeply engage in the immediate work of the grade as they read complex texts, write, talk, and solve problems.
- 5- Teachers will create common formative assessments to monitor students' academic growth and use results to plan differentiated instruction, interventions, and provide actionable feedback

Person Responsible Kari Ordiales (kari.ordiales@osceolaschools.net)

- 6- Principal, Assistant Principals, and Literacy Leadership Team will foster a culture of literacy in all content areas, conduct regular literacy walkthroughs, and provide feedback to teachers on best practices.
- 7- Data will be reviewed and discussed monthly in the stocktake and MTSS process and report progress to the School Advisory Council.

Person Responsible Kari Ordiales (kari.ordiales@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Academic performance in math is an area of focus because proficiency in math affects students' ability to graduate from high school and pursue post-secondary studies. Data from 2018-2019 reveal KMS students' proficiency in math (41%) is well below the state average (58%). While KMS' learning gains (52%) were 5% below state average, learning gains of the lowers quartile was 6% above the state average.

Measurable Outcome: KMS plans to meet the state average math learning gains (57%) and increase proficiency by at least 5%. KMS will also embrace the district goal of accelerating learning and ensuring all students make at least 1.5 years worth of growth, given that the Covid slide is expected to be deeper in math (about 50%) than reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Eugenia Rolando (eugenia.rolando@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: There are several new members in the Math Department. Teachers will work in Professional Learning Communities and embrace the Marzano instructional framework, which contains 23 high-yield evidence-based strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Marzano framework emphasizes high-yield strategies and is also used to evaluate teachers, to teachers are more likely to use a tool that is conducive to promoting student academic achievement and their own success while being evaluated. Collaboration is conducive to providing different levels of support to new teachers, brings diverse points of view which can assist a diverse population, and increases teacher commitment and sense of belonging.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1- Teachers will engage in effective, ongoing professional learning of the Marzano framework and acceleration strategies.
- 2- Teachers will work in highly effective Professional Learning Communities who engage in genuine collective inquiry to improve instruction and maximize learning.
- 2- Teachers will use relevant timely student data to analyze students' academic needs or unfinished learning and differentiate instruction (universal screener NWEA).
- 3- Teachers will use Curriculum Unit Plans developed by the district (a collaborative effort of experts from different schools) to provide high-impact instruction in essential grade-level skills and standards. Conceptual understanding, as opposed to procedural understanding, will be sought.
- 4- Teachers will intentionally plan lessons around real-world scenarios and provide "just in time" scaffolds for students to deeply engage in the immediate work of the grade, preteaching vocabulary and cognates, using manipulatives, and creating anchorcharts

Person Responsible Amanda Hirschauer (amanda.hirschauer@osceolaschools.net)

- 5- Teachers will create common formative assessments to monitor students' academic growth and use results to address misconceptions, plan differentiated instruction and intervention, and provide timely feedback.
- 6- Principal and assistant principals will conduct regular walkthroughs and review data to provide feedback on implementation
- 7- Data will be reviewed and discussed monthly in the stocktake and MTTS process and report progress to the School Advisory Council.

Person Responsible Amanda Hirschauer (amanda.hirschauer@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Science achievement at KMS is the lowest in the county, only 39% of students who took the FCAT 2.0 Assessment demonstrated proficiency. This low percentage closely resembles the percentage of students who are proficient readers, 37%. Science and the scientific method are pervasive in post-secondary education and life in general.

Measurable Outcome: Similar to the goal set forth for English Language Arts, KMS will strive to meet the district average of 51%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jane Mabra (jane.mabra@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Professional Learning Communities will continue embracing the Marzano framework. There will be an emphasis on vocabulary building while adopting the Argument-Driven-Inquiry instructional model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Argument-Driven Inquiry (ADI) instructional model as a tool for science teachers. ADI gives students opportunities to figure out how things work or why things happen while learning how to read, write, talk, and solve in science because it makes scientific argumentation the basis of all laboratory activities. ADI makes classroom science more like real science for students and helps students develop their vocabulary repertoire and make connections, which are conducive to deeper learning.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1- Teachers will work in highly effective Professional Learning Communities who engage in genuine collective inquiry to improve instruction and maximize learning.
- 2- Teachers will use Curriculum Unit Plans developed by the district (a collaborative effort of experts from different schools) to provide instruction in essential grade level skills and standards.
- 3- Teachers will intentionally plan Argument Driven Inquiry lessons and provide "just in time" scaffolds for students to deeply engage in the immediate work of the grade, such as pre-teaching vocabulary, identifying cognate words (those which are similar in English and Spanish, like precipitation=precipitacion), and using visual representations to help students engage in reading on-grade level texts, thinking, talking, and solving or arguing.
- 4- Teachers will create common formative assessments to monitor students' academic growth and use results to plan differentiated instruction and intervention, and provide actionable timely feedback.

Person Responsible Jane Mabra (jane.mabra@osceolaschools.net)

5- Principal and Assistant Principals will conduct regular reading walkthroughs and review data to provide feedback on implementation

6- The Literacy Literacy Team will also foster a culture of literacy in science, conduct regular literacy walkthroughs, and provide feedback to teachers on best practices.

7- Data will be reviewed and discussed monthly in the stocktake process and report progress to the School Advisory Council.

Person Responsible Jane Mabra (jane.mabra@osceolaschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ESSA (Every Student Succeeds Act) data reveal that students with disabilities and multiracial students are performing below the 41% Federal Index, with 35% and 27% indexes respectively.

Measurable Outcome: Students with disabilities and multiracial students will perform at or above the 42% Federal Index.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jane Mabra (jane.mabra@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: While the teachers who support students with disabilities are mostly experienced teachers, the role they have played so far in the purposeful planning of instruction and learning strategies has been inconsistent. By embracing the Marzano instructional framework with adequate scaffolds, pre-teaching of vocabulary, and critical thinking, students will expand their vocabulary and comprehension in all areas, but also become independent learners.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Following district guidelines, Pre-teaching is the teaching of vocabulary, language or content knowledge to students in preparation of an academic activity. Pre teaching will enhance overall understanding of the academic content, increase students understanding of the concepts by introducing vocabulary, as well as supporting mastery of the language.” (Jeanne Rodriguez, 2015)

Action Steps to Implement

- 1- Varying Exceptionalities (VE) Teachers will actively participate in collaborative inquiry process in the Professional Learning Communities they support, described in the English Language Arts, Math, and Science FOCUS AREAS.
- 2- VE Teachers will review the upcoming Curriculum Unit Plans (CUPs) and determine which concepts and vocabulary to focus on during pre-teaching.
- 3- VE Teachers will provide adequate scaffolds, visuals, cognates, and resources necessary to accelerate student learning.
- 4- Pre-teaching will take place during intervention time or during small group instruction in the classroom.
- 5- Regular Education and VE Teacher will assess effectiveness of strategy when administering common assessments.
- 6- Principal and Assistant Principals will conduct regular reading walkthroughs and review data to provide feedback on implementation

Person Responsible Jane Mabra (jane.mabra@osceolaschools.net)

- 7- Through the MTSS process, individual students who are not making adequate progress will be identified and corresponding tiers of support will be provided
- 8- Subgroup data will be reviewed and discussed monthly in the stocktake process and report progress to the School Advisory Council.

Person Responsible Jane Mabra (jane.mabra@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) is the process through which children and adults acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions (CASEL, 2020). When students do not develop adequate strategies or skills to handle challenging situations or people, or undergo trauma, their school attendance and discipline deteriorate, affecting academic performance. In the 2018-2019 school year, students served 263 days of OUT OF SCHOOL SUSPENSION (OSS) were served and 136 days of IN SCHOOL SUSPENSION (ISS). While those figures reflect a considerable decrease in infractions from the prior year, when there were 727 days of OSS and 407 days of ISS, these 399 days represent loss of instructional time and learning. Similarly, during 2019-2020, there was a schoolwide effort to improve attendance, which had been the lowest in the county. However, tracking during the last quarter, when digital learning started, was not accurate. Panorama surveys revealed 37% of students know how to regulate their emotions, which is in the 19th percentile of district data.

Measurable Outcome: The number of OSS and ISS, which were recorded for 3 quarters during 2018-2019 will decrease by 10%.
Attendance goal will remain at or above district average, 95%.
At least 50% of students will know how to control their emotions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sarah McKenney (sarah.mckenney@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: - Teachers will incorporate socio emotional learning to their lessons
- Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) schoolwide program for discipline and attendance. Classroom PBIS includes preventative and responsive approaches that may be effectively implemented with all students in a classroom and intensified to support small groups or a few individual students. Classroom PBIS strategies are important tools to decrease disruptions, increase instructional time, and improve student social behavior and academic outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Social and emotional skills matter for many areas of child development, including learning, health, and general wellbeing. Furthermore, recent research has demonstrated that high-quality, evidence-based social and emotional learning (SEL) programs produce positive outcomes for students, including improved behavior, attitudes, and academic performance (Durlak et al., 2011).

Action Steps to Implement

- 1- Teachers will use the socio emotional learning strategies embedded in the Curriculum Unit Plans developed by the district (a collaborative effort of experts from different schools)
- 2- Teachers will establish, teach, and reteach classroom expectations. Teachers will use visual prompts, behavioral rehearsals, and demonstrations to reinforce positive behaviors. Teachers will use JAGS to reward positive behaviors.
- 3- Deans will follow suit with hallway, bathroom, media center, and cafeteria expectations, emphasizing that these expectations are associated with good behavior but most importantly safety.
- 4- Dean will teach PBIS strategies to bus drivers before the beginning of the school year, given that buses are the primary area where students receive discipline referrals.
- 5- PBIS Committee will organize monthly and quarterly schoolwide rewards for attendance, discipline, and academic achievement.

Person Responsible Sarah McKenney (sarah.mckenney@osceolaschools.net)

6- Through the MTSS process, individual students who exhibit poor discipline, academic progress, or attendance will be identified and adequate tiers of support will be provided.

7- Schoolwide data will be reviewed and discussed monthly in the stocktake process

Person Responsible Sarah McKenney (sarah.mckenney@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for All Students

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	"Education is the most powerful weapon you can use to change the world." - Nelson Mandela. KMS is a Title I School serving a large percentage of economically disadvantaged students, some of whom could be the 1st generation to attend college. While we may not be able to solve students' current socioeconomic situation, fostering, promoting, and instilling a post secondary culture may awaken interests and confidence students need to pursue high school graduation and a post secondary education. KMS earned the highest acceleration points in the district, 88%.
Measurable Outcome:	The elective course AVID and the rigorous high school courses Algebra and Geometry are means to develop a post secondary culture for all students. By the end of the school year, at least 90% of all eligible students will pass an End Of Course Exam.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Eugenia Rolando (eugenia.rolando@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Schoolwide AVID strategies: writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization, and reading (WICOR). Teachers working in Professional Learning Communities using the instructional Marzano framework.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization, and reading (WICOR) evidence-based strategies are the foundation of college and career readiness, and embedded within the Marzano instructional framework. WICOR strategies are necessary to reach academic achievement in rigorous courses. Teachers working in Professional Learning Communities can support schoolwide initiatives conducive to instilling a culture of post secondary education.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1- Teachers of High School credit courses (Algebra and Geometry) will adopt the same strategies listed for the focus area math. Teachers will engage in effective, ongoing professional learning of the Marzano framework and acceleration strategies. All students eligible for acceleration will participate in high school courses.
- 2- Teachers will work in highly effective Professional Learning Communities who engage in genuine collective inquiry to improve instruction and maximize learning. These teachers, who are often the only teachers for a course, heavily rely on district PLCs.
- 2- Teachers will use relevant timely student data to analyze students' academic needs or unfinished learning and differentiate instruction (universal screener NWEA).
- 3- Teachers will use Curriculum Unit Plans developed by the district (a collaborative effort of experts from different schools) to provide high-impact instruction in essential grade-level skills and standards. Conceptual understanding, as opposed to procedural understanding, will be sought.

Person Responsible Frankie Franceschi (frankie.franceschi@osceolaschools.net)

- 4- Teachers will intentionally plan lessons around real-world scenarios and provide "just in time" scaffolds for students to deeply engage in the immediate work of the grade.
- 5- Teachers will create common formative assessments to monitor students' academic growth and use results to address misconceptions, plan differentiated instruction and intervention, and provide timely feedback.
- 6- Through the MTSS process, individual students who are not making adequate progress in high school rigorous courses will be identified and corresponding tiers of support will be provided.
- 7- Student data will be discussed monthly in the stocktake and MTTSS process and report progress to the School Advisory Council.

8- The AVID site team will identify a WICOR strategy for the month to share and promote schoolwide for students to embrace and own. WICOR strategies are evidence-based.

Person Responsible Frankie Franceschi (frankie.franceschi@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

The school engages families, students and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral

expectations, holds staff responsible for implementing high-quality instruction, and communicates high expectations for all students. Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building.

- Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in disaggregated data
- Student work is displayed throughout school
- All students are enrolled in college- and career-ready prep curriculum

A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been

created. Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/ patterns

among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, in-and out-of-school

suspension. and attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for particular groups

within a school and What needs to be done. Such as, Establishing specific strategies, but attainable for reducing

disproportionate discipline with staff, student, and family input. Implementing evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and provide ongoing training

and feedback to teachers on implementing these approaches. The administration ensures that teachers have

resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. The administrators engage staff members in periodic team building activities, the principal writes a weekly newsletter to maintain staff well informed and featuring staff members going above and beyond their duty. The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on schoolwide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. Teacher leadership in the decision-making process also contributes to building a positive culture. Department Heads and Grade Level Chairs actively participate in developing, promoting, and implementing schoolwide initiatives. The PBIS Committee also promotes a positive school culture among students and staff.

The master schedule is structured to include collaborative planning and ensure it is rooted in data on student progress and interests. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. The school curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students.

The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC

council. It reaches out to families and the community regularly - seeking input from families on how the school can support students, and following up with what's being done as a result. We ensure parents and teachers can communicate effectively via email, Remind text messages, and offer translation services when needed. The school intentionally engages with families of historically underserved students. Home visits have become the staple of KMS Leadership as we strive to engage students in distance learning. The school provides all teachers with training on social and emotional skills, culturally competent, and management.

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

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$9,412.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Professional Learning Communities Professional Development & Data Digging</i>			
	6400	210-Retirement	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$300.00
			<i>Notes: Retirement</i>			
	6400	220-Social Security	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$229.50
			<i>Notes: Social Security</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Professional Learning Communities Professional Development & Data Digging</i>			

	5100	210-Retirement	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: Retirement</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$382.50
			<i>Notes: Social Security</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$9,987.31
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$5,489.00
			<i>Notes: Remediation conducted as needed, targeting lower quartile students during face 2 face and digital tutoring opportunities</i>			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Professional Learning Communities Professional Development & Data Digging</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$548.90
			<i>Notes: Retirement</i>			
	6400	210-Retirement	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$300.00
			<i>Notes: Retirement</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$419.91
			<i>Notes: Social Security</i>			
	6400	220-Social Security	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$229.50
			<i>Notes: Social Security</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$8,235.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Remediation conducted as needed, targeting lower quartile students during face 2 face and digital tutoring opportunities</i>			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: Professional Learning Communities Professional Development & Data Digging</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: Retirement</i>			
	6400	210-Retirement	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$200.00
			<i>Notes: Retirement</i>			

	5100	220-Social Security	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$382.50
			<i>Notes: Social Security</i>			
	6400	220-Social Security	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$153.00
			<i>Notes: Social Security</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$8,235.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Remediation conducted as needed, targeting lower quartile students during face 2 face and digital tutoring opportunities</i>			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: Remediation conducted as needed, targeting lower quartile students during face 2 face and digital tutoring opportunities</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: Retirement</i>			
	6400	210-Retirement	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$200.00
			<i>Notes: Retirement</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$382.50
	6400	220-Social Security	0251 - Kissimmee Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$153.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for All Students				\$0.00
					Total:	\$35,870.31