Narcoossee Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Narcoossee Middle School

2700 N NARCOOSSEE RD, Saint Cloud, FL 34771

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Francisco Rivera Mieles

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	52%
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: A (64%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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.](http://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

Narcoossee Middle School

2700 N NARCOOSSEE RD, Saint Cloud, FL 34771

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	No	53%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

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

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.

Our #1 priority is student achievement with high expectations being the responsibility of our entire community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Everything we do is solely for the students; we believe we can teach all students and that all students will learn given the appropriate resources.

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
Weeden, Gary	Principal	All school operations. Supervise the ELA department, school budget, SIP,
Melvin, Michael	Dean	Stock Take Team member
Alexander, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Math Coach
Smalling, Marisha	Instructional Coach	Reading and literacy Coach
Clevenger, Marcia	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule, supervise Science, ELA, Stock Take
Laser, Sabine	Instructional Coach	MTSS Coach
Schneider, Lucille	Assistant Principal	Discipline, 8th grade observaitons, school operations

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/9/2020, Francisco Rivera Mieles

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.*
8

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.*
29

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
93

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)	52%
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: A (64%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

---

* 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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	415	402	399	0	0	0	0	1216
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	13	30	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/31/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	397	402	411	0	0	0	0	1210
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	53	53	0	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	40	15	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on statewide 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	35	39	40	0	0	0	0	114

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	1	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	397	402	411	0	0	0	0	1210
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	53	53	0	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	40	15	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on statewide 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	35	39	40	0	0	0	0	114

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	1	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
ELA Achievement	62%	45%	54%	63%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	48%	54%	61%	51%	54%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	42%	47%	49%	39%	44%
Math Achievement	65%	49%	58%	61%	48%	56%
Math Learning Gains	60%	51%	57%	60%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	47%	51%	55%	49%	50%
Science Achievement	62%	47%	51%	66%	51%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	86%	72%	72%	90%	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	60%	48%	12%	54%	6%
	2018	58%	46%	12%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	57%	47%	10%	52%	5%
	2018	58%	46%	12%	51%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	64%	49%	15%	56%	8%
	2018	65%	52%	13%	58%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	55%	45%	10%	55%	0%
	2018	62%	43%	19%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	33%	30%	3%	54%	-21%
	2018	41%	29%	12%	54%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	67%	47%	20%	46%	21%
	2018	57%	43%	14%	45%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		26%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	56%	42%	14%	48%	8%
	2018	54%	42%	12%	50%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	62%	38%	67%	33%
2018	100%	68%	32%	65%	35%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	86%	73%	13%	71%	15%
2018	84%	70%	14%	71%	13%
Compare		2%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	49%	30%	61%	18%
2018	90%	52%	38%	62%	28%
Compare		-11%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	44%	54%	57%	41%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	97%	39%	58%	56%	41%
Compare		1%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	30	51	49	35	54	53	27	56	63		
ELL	40	53	46	45	52	44	22	65	69		
ASN	88	73		88	64		67	89	89		
BLK	57	56	48	59	59	61	53	86	79		
HSP	58	58	50	60	57	49	56	83	76		
MUL	54	71		48	58						
WHT	66	59	45	70	63	57	70	88	75		
FRL	49	54	49	53	56	49	49	74	76		
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	29	55	48	36	51	39	30	64			
ELL	25	53	48	39	53	49	16	62			
ASN	74	63		87	89		78	73	90		
BLK	54	51	46	49	56	50	48	75	80		
HSP	56	58	47	60	57	55	47	82	77		
MUL	71	63		63	58						
WHT	68	62	43	72	63	63	75	91	82		
FRL	55	56	45	58	56	58	53	81	77		
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	40	36	26	44	40	15	58			
ELL	25	51	48	32	49	47	26	69			
ASN	80	77		73	67		90	100	87		
BLK	52	57	56	51	62	56	65	89	81		
HSP	59	58	48	53	55	51	52	90	78		
MUL	63	68		71	57		75				
WHT	68	61	48	68	63	63	73	89	86		
FRL	53	56	46	50	54	55	55	82	71		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	630
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
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	80
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	62
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	60

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	58
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	66
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	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

ELA Lowest 25%. It is above the state average and up from last year. One contributing factor could be a lack of access to grade level reading in core subjects. Of this, our FRL students showed the biggest loss in ELA and Math.

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

7th grade Math- The previous year was very high. Also, many proficient 7th graders took the 8th grade FSA. 6th grade also dropped 7 points which could be attributed to a new teacher in the PLC. Algebra EOC was also a significant drop of 11 points.

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.

Lowest 25% in both Math and ELA are closest to state and district average.

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

ELL ELA achievement went up 15 points. A focus by a new RCS of monitoring these students was a big focus and careful scheduling for support.

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

Number of 6th graders who were level 1 in Reading and Math

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

1. Number of 6th graders who were level 1 in Reading and Math
2. Lowest 25% ELA (FRL)
3. Algebra 1 EOC Pass Rate
4. 6th grade Math Achievement
5. 7th grade Math Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Given that 35% of current students are currently not proficient in Math, , productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematic achievement for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase proficiency to 69%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Alexander (jennifer.alexander@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Studies show that the analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis offonnative and summative assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teach problem solving strategies and higher order thinking concepts differentiated lessons
2. Students will be engaged in instruction using high quality questioning techniques supported by quality feedback
3. Provide interventions for students who are not proficient in math
4. Utilize formative assessments including NWEA to monitor student learning and provide feedback.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Alexander (jennifer.alexander@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2018- 2019 arid 2019-2020 school data, ELA proficiency is 62%, The goal is a proficiency of 65% while focusing on all ELL, ESE, Black, Hispariic, arid FRL students.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal is a proficiency rate of 65%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marisha Smalling (marisha.smalling@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and in meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaboarative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous and aligned curriculum. Additionally,schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented,can effectively double the speed of learning, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003)

Action Steps to Implement

1. All staff will be trained in best practices strategies for increasing engagement through quality instruction to improve literacy
2. Ongoing AVID training to increase student engagement
3. Interventions will be provided for struggling students who are not demonstrating proficiency
4. Staff will use progress monitoring data from NWEA, Osceola Writes, TeenBiz, and common assessments to identify individual student needs

Person Responsible   Marisha Smalling (marisha.smalling@osceolaschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	While the school received a grade of A, data shows that ESE, , Hispanic and Males would have earned a B this year. ELL alone would have received a D.
Measurable Outcome:	ESE and ESOL will increase to 54% of possible points in school grading system.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gary Weeden (gary.weeden@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all their students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four specific elements related to curriculum: Content- the information and skills that students need to learn Process -how students make sense of the content being taught Product - how students demonstrate what they have learned Affect - the feelings and attitudes that affect students' learning

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will participate in PD that focuses on instructional strategies that scaffold content for ELL and ESE students. Training will include ELLevate, AVID and ESE support strategies
2. Leadership will ensure that students are supported in all courses by providing ELL and ESE instructional support for teachers
3. Students will participate in scaffolded interventions

Person Responsible   Gary Weeden (gary.weeden@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Well-implemented programs designed to foster SEL are associated with positive outcomes, ranging from better test scores and higher graduation rates to improved social behavior. Social-emotional competencies include skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions; mindsets, such as thinking positively about how to handle challenges; and habits, such as coming to class prepared. A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for learning. It provides the foundation that students need, to develop the social, emotional, and academic competencies they need to succeed in life.
Measurable Outcome:	Rais the number of students feeling connected to the school by 10% on student climate survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Melvin (michael.melvin@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess individual learning styles and be flexible in time management to allow for meeting these different needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Social and Emotional learning (SEL) is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered,. They use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning and reflection activities
2. School will develop structures, relationships and learning opportunities that support students' Social Emotional development
3. Leadership will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop interventions as retired

Person Responsible   Michael Melvin (michael.melvin@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide Post-Secondary Culture for all Students	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A college-going culture builds the expectation of postsecondary education for all students-not just the best students. It inspires the best in every student, and it supports students in achieving their goals.Students who have the parental, school, and community expectations that college is the next step after high school see college as the norm However, the idea that college is the next step after high school may seem unrealistic for those students who are from one or more of the following groups: low achievers, middle to low-income levels, underrepresented minorities, disabled youth, and families where no one has attended college before.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the A/B Honor role by 5%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marcia Clevenger (marcia.clevenger@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Schools with a strong future orientation, that engage all students in planning for life after graduation. With effective sctiool-based teams that are all anchors of implementing postsecondary work. Which shape a culture of success in which students aspire to a quality life beyond sctlool.Then in such schools, students will fully participate in their academic and personal development to access a variety of opportullities to meet ttleir needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students should be supported in their efforts to reflect on their future and should have multiple opportunities to do so. A school culture committed to promoting students' aspirations for continuing their education must expand beyond just lessons students alone.{Poliner & Lieber 2004)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be supported , advised and encouraged in an environment that fosters post secondary and career readiness for success in school and life
2. Guidance and Deans will plan activities that will allow all students to have a greater voice in school life and develop and strengthen their capacity to engage in respectful dialogue and civil conversation that matter to them.
3.An overall "college going atmosphere" will continue to be championed by the AVID Site Team and all staff

Person Responsible	Marcia Clevenger (marcia.clevenger@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science education has been to cultivate students' scientific habits of mind, develop their capability to engage in scientilfic inquiry, and teach students how to reason in a scienti1ic context. Science allows students to explore their world and discover new things. It is also an active subject, containing activities such as hands-on labs and experiments. This mak:es science well-suited to active younger children. Science is an import.ant part of the foundation for education for all children.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Science proficiency by 5%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gary Weeden (gary.weeden@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The science curriculum must be made relevant to students by framing lessons in contexts that give facts meaning, teach concepts that matter in students' lives, and provide opportunities for solving complex problems_
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who manipulate scientific ideas using hands-on/minds-on strategies and activities are more successful than peers who are taught by teachers relying primarily on lecture and the textbook (Lynch & Zenchak, 2002)_

Action Steps to Implement

1 _Teachers will attain and break down achievement data from district assessments during weekly common
planning PLC_
2. Teachers will participate in PD that will AVID strategies including Kagan, WICOR , Cornell notes and interactive notebooks.
3. Teacher will provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction based on grade level .standards.data, student tracking,
collaborative planning, and data analysis_

Person Responsible	Gary Weeden (gary.weeden@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

This 6th grade group is getting more teachers for interventions than any other grade level. This intense focus on this group of students will be measured for progress at the end of December on the next NWEA.

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.

At NCMS we will be using our WIN time to address SEL topics and promoting an overall sense of connecting students to the school. Tier 1 groups will rotate through different groups with culminating projects that will include service projects for our community during these difficult times. Parents will be engaged digitally with an increase of our presence on social media. Last year only 25% of students said that they were connected to an adult on our campus. This was a low number based on the staff's perceptions. WIN time will be used to intentionally build relationships with students who will be assigned to the same teacher for the year. One day of the week will focus on SEL lessons that are designed by guidance and follow themes for each month such as self-worth. Another day will use a bullying curriculum that is from Best Buddies, the third day will be an AVID binder check with an additional focus on college and career planning. By doing this we plan to increase the amount of students who have an adult on campus with whom they feel connected. We also plan to reduce bullying incidents on our campus and increase academic success as measured through A/B Honor Roll as a result of this initiative.

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: Math				$9,800.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	0000		0040 - Narcoossee Middle School	Other		$4,900.00
			Notes: FSA Assessment 6,7,8			
	0000		0040 - Narcoossee Middle School	School Improvement Funds		$4,900.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post-Secondary Culture for all Students				$0.00

6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
		Total:	$9,800.00