School District of Osceola County, FL

Neptune Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Neptune Middle School

2727 NEPTUNE RD, Kissimmee, FL 34744

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Thomas Rademacher

Start Date for this Principal: 8/17/2018

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)	96%
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: B (61%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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

Neptune Middle School

2727 NEPTUNE RD, Kissimmee, FL 34744

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	71%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	84%

School Grades History

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

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.

Excellence for all . . . whatever it takes.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Education which inspires all students to achieve their highest potential.

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
Rademacher, Thomas	Principal	The principal oversees the vision and mission of the school. Assigns the roles and responsibilities of the leadership team to ensure the SIP is being monitored. Conducts a monthly stocktake to monitor the SIP and make adjustments based on the data.
Remy, Christina	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal oversees the Science Achievement goal as well as the ELL Task force and Title 1. Meets with the Science department to ensure they progress monitor students and students are getting the support they need through WIN time.
Sassic, Dustin	Assistant Principal	In charge of ensuring students are in the appropriate classes through master scheduling. Overseeing the MTSS process, PLC process, and Civics. Preparing the stocktake process with each subject area lead to ensure Neptune continues to move forward.
Crisp, Kara	Instructional Coach	Tracking the each PLC as they move through the 7 stages. Ensuring the elective team is progressing through the PLC process. Supports all new teachers.
Wilson, Lisa	Instructional Coach	In charge of the mathgoal. Supports the Math PLC to ensure students are being supported on all levels and monitors progress towards the math goals.
Jimenez, Sussy	Instructional Coach	In charge of the literacy goal and ensuring literacy is school wide. Supports the literacy PLC to ensure students are being supported on all levels and monitors progress towards the literacy goals.
	School Counselor	Will focus on ensuring the students have a support for their social and emotional learning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 8/17/2018, Thomas Rademacher

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.*
6

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.*
55

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
63

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)	96%
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: B (61%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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	300	333	357	0	0	0	0	990
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	72	58	0	0	0	0	198
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	72	59	0	0	0	0	187

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	39	41	47	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/17/2020

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	152	232	0	0	0	0	426
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	45	42	0	0	0	0	131
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	11	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	68	94	0	0	0	0	214

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	28	69	83	0	0	0	0	180

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	1	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	152	232	0	0	0	0	426
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	45	42	0	0	0	0	131
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	11	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	68	94	0	0	0	0	214

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	28	69	83	0	0	0	0	180

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	1	0	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	52%	45%	54%	51%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	48%	54%	49%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	42%	47%	36%	39%	44%
Math Achievement	55%	49%	58%	55%	48%	56%
Math Learning Gains	58%	51%	57%	62%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	47%	51%	56%	49%	50%
Science Achievement	52%	47%	51%	53%	51%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	72%	72%	78%	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	50%	48%	2%	54%	-4%
	2018	46%	46%	0%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	52%	47%	5%	52%	0%
	2018	43%	46%	-3%	51%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	45%	49%	-4%	56%	-11%
	2018	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	53%	45%	8%	55%	-2%
	2018	45%	43%	2%	52%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	23%	30%	-7%	54%	-31%
	2018	17%	29%	-12%	54%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
08	2019	44%	47%	-3%	46%	-2%
	2018	51%	43%	8%	45%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		27%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	42%	42%	0%	48%	-6%
	2018	46%	42%	4%	50%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	62%	36%	67%	31%
2018	98%	68%	30%	65%	33%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	73%	6%	71%	8%
2018	72%	70%	2%	71%	1%
Compare		7%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	93%	49%	44%	61%	32%
2018	98%	52%	46%	62%	36%
Compare		-5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	44%	56%	57%	43%
2018	100%	39%	61%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	24	51	45	28	48	47	28	55			
ELL	30	47	46	34	49	52	21	57	77		
ASN	65	62		81	58		58	85	100		
BLK	46	54	46	41	59	61	33	88			
HSP	49	53	49	51	56	52	50	77	90		
MUL	58	60		56	74		53	93			
WHT	64	60	49	72	66	76	66	91	94		
FRL	47	53	46	49	56	54	46	78	90		
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	20	35	25	19	42	45	15	28			
ELL	19	37	38	21	37	40	16	44	36		
ASN	68	55		80	67		80				
BLK	46	43	40	43	56	43	59	85	67		
HSP	44	47	40	45	49	47	45	71	63		
MUL	63	50		50	59		57	75			
WHT	67	52	31	67	62	69	66	80	79		
FRL	46	46	35	46	52	48	47	71	64		
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	8	29	28	13	51	54	13	38			
ELL	16	35	33	24	52	52	7	33			
ASN	73	65		81	85						
BLK	46	53	46	48	64	52	64	82	89		
HSP	45	45	34	50	62	56	45	73	67		
MUL	51	50		50	58						

| 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
WHT	67	59	41	69	61	59	67	89	79		
FRL	45	45	33	48	60	56	47	72	69		

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	602
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	47
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	73
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	54
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	66
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	71
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	56
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%. There was a lack of VE support for most of the year to our lowest 25% students.

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

Algebra pass rate. We gave more students the opportunity to take and pass the Algebra EOC then we ever had before.

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.

Math Achievement. Most of our level 2 students did not move to proficient.

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

ELA Lowest 25%. We seperated our ELA and Reading teachers and focused on Tier 1 instruction in those areas.

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

Students who are failing Math.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25%
2. Algebra Proficiency.
3. Math Proficiency
4. Social Emotional/School Culture
5. Science Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The leadership team helps to maintain a cohesive school vision and strategy focused on student achievement. Improvement in this area, rather than the operational management of a school, is the main priority of leadership teams. Effective instructional leadership teams are powerful levers for making change in schools. These teams typically include the principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches, teacher leaders,. and other school leaders and can provide a systematic way for schools to execute their most important priorities. It was found through the Insight survey submitted by teachers that there was a need for growth in instructional leadership.
Measurable Outcome:	Insight Survey Retention Section Response 2019-2020 Opportunities to pursue leadership roles 15% 2020-2021 20%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dustin Sassic (dustin.sassic@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase teachers leadership roles within the school leadership teams can improve teacher motivation and confidence in their own abilities and had taught them to motivate, lead and encourage other adults leading to improved self-confidence, increased knowledge, and an improved attitude to teaching among teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Great leaders understand that teachers know what their students need and what they themselves-need to succeed. When teachers are involved in examining data and making important decisions based on data that inform how they continuously improve their schools, leadership teams can ensure that everyone in the building is focused on the core business of the school-improving student learning outcomes_When teachers work together in teams, they coach each other, learn from one another, and become experts in specific areas_ This team dynamic-in which everyone plays a role and is valued-provides them with a sate space to refine their practices to improve student outcomes_ It also boosts teacher morale, making it more likely that good teachers will stay in the profession longer_ In these collaborative environments, transparency of practice and data are expected to help drive improvement (Gates Foundation 2019)_

Action Steps to Implement

1 Strategic planning will move away from "classic" approaches to adaptive ones. Shifting away from making

predictions, collecting data, and executing from the top down-and towards conducting experiments (such as

small, 30-day projects), using pattern recognition, and execution by the whole_
2_ The team will create 30-day improvement strategies that actualize the annual goals. The 30-day period is

intentional because it forces urgency but leaves enough time to change course if the improvement project

is
not working.
3_ Cultivate a mindset of focus, discipline, and accountability within every staff member and ensure that concrete actions are taken every day toward goals_
4_Select the team so it has a balance of visionaries and integrators .. Both are equally valuable and necessary,
especially with leadership ip teams

Person Responsible   Dustin Sassic (dustin.sassic@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Given the 2019 -2020 school data finding that only 55% of students were proficient in math, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematics achievement for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	The outcome for 2020-2021 is to increase math proficiency by 4%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Wilson (lisa.wilson@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 of formative 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. Staff will teach problem solving strategies and high order thinking concepts through the delivery of differentiated mathematics lessons.
2.Staff will assist students monitoring and reflecting on applying mathematical practices. Staff will expose students to multiple problem-sotving strategies, including visual representations in their work.
3.Staff will provide supplemental learning opportunities to students who are identified as not proficient in mathematics or who are identified as at-risk of becoming non proficient in mathematics based on a variety of
assessments. In addition, advanced students will be offered to students to extend their learning.
4.Staff will develop outcomes representing high expectations and rigor that are connected to a sequence of
learning.
5.Students will be cognitively engaged in instruction using high quality questioning and discussion techniques,
supported be quality feedback and the ability to self assess progress related to the learning outcomes.

Person Responsible	Lisa Wilson (lisa.wilson@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2018- 2019 arid 2019-2020 school data, ELA proficiency 52%, which is below the state average of 55%. The district average is 47%, however, the goal is to increase above state average of 55% while focusing all ELL, ESE, Black, Hispanic, and FRL students.
Measurable Outcome:	The outcome for 2020-2021 is to increase ELA proficiency by 4%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sussy Jimenez (sussy.jimenez@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and I 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 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 practice strategies for increasing student engagement through quality instruction to improve student literacy.
2.Components of content-relevant strategies will include whole group, small group and one-on-one conferencing to meet the individual needs of all students.
3.Training on the effectiveness of increased student engagement in relation to student achievement will be offered.
4. Instructional staff will differentiate instruction with varied, research-based instructional strategies following
analysis of assessment results to improve literacy proficiency of all students, as evidenced by targeted, tiered
interventions.
5. Instructional staff will utilize explicit instructional strategies to improve student comprehension of informational text through classroom experiences and other professional development.
6. Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on formative assessments.
7. Administration will offer additional intervention time to support struggling students.
8.Staff will use progress monitoring data, classroom observations and scoring rubrics to identify individual students.

Person Responsible	Sussy Jimenez (sussy.jimenez@osceolaschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA data showed in 2018-2019 one sub group was below the ESSA level 41 %. This affected the proficiency and student achievement seen throughout the state reporting of school data. The school is TS&I status.
Measurable Outcome:	ESSA Data for 2018-2019 ESE- 40% will increase in 2020-2021 to be above 41 %.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dustin Sassic (dustin.sassic@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately 7 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, that share common planning, will participate in weekly PLC meetings that will focus on the development of both standardized lesson plans and common assessments for all students.
2.PLC meetings will be supported and work in conjunction with the instructional coaches.
3. Teachers will focus on creating learning goals and targets for individual students.
4. Teachers will participate in professional development that focuses instructional strategies that scaffold content for ESE subgroups. Professional development training will include AVID WICOR instructional strategies, ELLEVATION training, and ESE support strategies.
5. The ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of the RCS ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing ESE instructional strategies and professional development for teachers.
6. Students will participate in targeted intervention Tier 1,2,& 3.

Person Responsible   Dustin Sassic (dustin.sassic@osceolaschools.net)

#5. 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:	2019-2020 SEL Climate Survey showed 38% of students answered favorable for school belonging. In 2020- 2021 this question will be increased 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christina Remy (christina.remy@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 and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students. Identifying and building on
students' individual assets and passions.
2. Teacher will plan to build an environment of belonging.
3. Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning and reflection activities.
4. Teachers will encourage and facilitate student's shared decision-making through consensus/action planning.
5. Teachers will use active learning strategies like hands-on, experiential, and project-based activities.
6. Teacher will integrate SEL strategies into their curriculum, such as, self management, self confidence. self
efficacy, and social awareness where applicable.
7. Teachers will facilitate peer learning and teaching collaborative learning.
8. School will develop structures, relationships, and learning opportunities that support students' SE development.
9. All surveys will be analyzed to identify schools interventions that will support SEL and school-wide plan will
be developed.
10. The leadership team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop interventions.

Person Responsible	Christina Remy (christina.remy@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide post secondary for all students	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A college-going culture builds the expectation of post-secondary 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:	In 2019-2020 the the grade distribution at the end of the year was as follows: A-30%, B-32%, C- 23%, D 11%, F-2% In 2020-2021 there will be an increase in grades A, B, and C by 4% each grade.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kara Crisp (kara.crisp@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Schools with a strong future orientation, that engage all students in planning for life after graduation. With effective school-based teams that are anchors of implementing post-secondary work. Which shape a culture of success in which students aspire to a quality life beyond school. Then in such schools, students will fully participate in their academic and personal development to access a variety of opportunities to meet their needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students should be supported ill 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 college and career readiness for success in school and in life.
2. The school will participate ill an articulated set of grade-level sequential activities that focus on personal development and career exploration, college preparation, and the completion of a post-secondary plan.
3. Teachers will enhance study skills and meta-cognitive skills that promote goal setting, self-assessment, time management, and planning.
4. Teachers will plan to incorporate activities that will practice 21st-century life skills.
5. Administration and the Guidance department 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.
6. The school will create a plan that creates all environment that develops greater bonds with peers, usually
cutting across the exclusionary social groups.

Person Responsible	Kara Crisp (kara.crisp@osceolaschools.net)

#7. 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 scientific inquiry, and teach students how to reason in a scientific 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 makes science well-suited to active younger children. Science is an import.ant part of the foundation for education for all children.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2018-2019 science achievement was 52% In 2020-2021 student achievement will increase by 4%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christina Remy (christina.remy@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_Science teachers participate in PLC process weekly to ensure content and pacing and re-teaching of standards_
3_ Teachers will participate in PD that will AVID strategies including Kagan, WICOR , Cornell notes and interactive notebooks.
4_ Teachers will learn and implement standards based stations and implement differentiated instruction as an
instructional strategy to breakdown student data and content mastery_
5_ ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL. compliance specialist
and RCS ensuring students are supported in science courses_
6_ Teachers will provide individual student data chats __
7_ T he administration will provide professional development sessions to teachers as they request it and the
need arises.
8_Teacher will provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction based on grade level,standards.data, student tracking, collaborative planning, and data analysis

Person Responsible	Christina Remy (christina.remy@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Through our school stocktake process we will monitor each of these priorities to ensure we remain on target.

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 engage families, students. and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction, and hold staff responsible for implementing any changes. It frequently
communicate high expectations for all students (e.g., "All students are college material"). Leaders demonstrate
how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example:
•Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in dis aggregated 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 dis aggregated 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 leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on school-wide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. They also structure the master schedule 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 schools, 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 early and often - not just when there is an issue. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students, and follow up with what's being done as a result. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation, and provide food and childcare). It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically under-served students (e.g., by providing opportunities for small-group conversations with school leaders). Finally, 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: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team				$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$2,505.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		120-Classroom Teachers	0311 - Neptune Middle School	Title, I Part A		$2,505.00
			Notes: Math Remediation			
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$2,505.17**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		120-Classroom Teachers	0311 - Neptune Middle School	Title, I Part A		$2,505.17
			Notes: Reading Remediation			
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**				**$0.00**
5	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**				**$0.00**
6	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide post secondary for all students**				**$0.00**
7	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**				**$5,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		690-Computer Software	0311 - Neptune Middle School	School Improvement Funds		$5,000.00
			Notes: PENDA Learning			

	Total:	$10,010.17