School District of Osceola County, FL

Parkway Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Parkway Middle School

857 FLORIDA PKWY, Kissimmee, FL 34743

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Misty Cruz   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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

Parkway Middle School

857 FLORIDA PKWY, Kissimmee, FL 34743

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	93%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	91%

School Grades History

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

Parkway Middle School facilitates a supportive and safe climate that challenges students to develop into balanced, compassionate, creative and reflective life-long learners; while fostering a culture of tolerance, rigor and diversity. Students are encouraged to be productive citizens in a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Parkway is a collaborative community that uses data to drive a rigorous, standards-based curriculum in order to excel in student achievement.

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
Gould, Megan	Principal	Over see the operations of the school, provide instructional leadership to staff, and ensure the mission and vision of the school is accomplished.
Harris, Virginia	Instructional Coach	Provide coaching support for teachers with instructional practices in literacy. Assist with MTSS for Reading.
Collin, Amy	Assistant Principal	Assist with overseeing the operations of the school, provide instructional leadership to staff, and ensure the mission and vision of the school is accomplished.
Hernandez, Marc	Assistant Principal	Assist with overseeing the operations of the school, provide instructional leadership to staff, and ensure the mission and vision of the school is accomplished.
Farrell, Matthew	Instructional Coach	Provide coaching support for teachers in Math and Science. Provide MTSS support for Math.
Doodnath, Tagemattie	School Counselor	Provide social and emotional support for our students. Assist with MTSS behavior. Contribute to the Threat Assessment Team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2015, Misty Cruz

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.*

0

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.*

63

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

75

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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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	266	262	323	0	0	0	0	851
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	10	15	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	35	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	98	136	0	0	0	0	312
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	102	141	0	0	0	0	332

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	32	35	48	0	0	0	0	115

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	6	3	8	0	0	0	0	17

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/4/2020

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	305	294	290	0	0	0	0	889
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	12	28	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	29	44	0	0	0	0	98
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	124	120	0	0	0	0	344

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	25	29	42	0	0	0	0	96

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	4	7	8	0	0	0	0	19

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	305	294	290	0	0	0	0	889
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	12	28	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	29	44	0	0	0	0	98
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	124	120	0	0	0	0	344

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	25	29	42	0	0	0	0	96

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	4	7	8	0	0	0	0	19

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	45%	45%	54%	48%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	40%	48%	54%	46%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	42%	47%	31%	39%	44%
Math Achievement	40%	49%	58%	42%	48%	56%
Math Learning Gains	42%	51%	57%	45%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	47%	51%	44%	49%	50%
Science Achievement	46%	47%	51%	41%	51%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	71%	72%	72%	60%	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	43%	48%	-5%	54%	-11%
	2018	40%	46%	-6%	52%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	39%	47%	-8%	52%	-13%
	2018	37%	46%	-9%	51%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	46%	49%	-3%	56%	-10%
	2018	48%	52%	-4%	58%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	34%	45%	-11%	55%	-21%
	2018	37%	43%	-6%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	16%	30%	-14%	54%	-38%
	2018	20%	29%	-9%	54%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
08	2019	35%	47%	-12%	46%	-11%
	2018	33%	43%	-10%	45%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	38%	42%	-4%	48%	-10%
	2018	43%	42%	1%	50%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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	70%	73%	-3%	71%	-1%
2018	67%	70%	-3%	71%	-4%
Compare		3%			
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	70%	49%	21%	61%	9%
2018	94%	52%	42%	62%	32%
Compare		-24%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	86%	44%	42%	57%	29%
2018	100%	39%	61%	56%	44%
Compare		-14%			

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	18	28	20	21	35	30	23	38			
ELL	23	31	31	23	37	37	20	49	57		
ASN	50	33		57	42						
BLK	47	46	48	32	33	20	52	71	59		
HSP	43	39	29	39	43	43	43	69	74		
MUL	44	40		27	14						
WHT	51	43		53	44	58	64	79	87		
FRL	37	35	29	32	37	36	35	63	66		
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	26	43	36	25	36	26	30	35			
ELL	13	41	48	16	35	31	11	38			
ASN	93	86		73	64						
BLK	47	35	30	50	64	50	57	71	100		
HSP	43	48	46	44	49	42	46	70	87		
MUL	46	31		47	47						
WHT	57	49		66	55		78	83	90		
FRL	43	46	45	44	50	45	46	70	90		
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	10	25	17	8	35	39	12	25			
ELL	16	36	34	17	36	45	10	30			
ASN	86	64		69	69						
BLK	42	58	42	37	41	43	25	68			
HSP	46	43	32	41	45	43	39	58	89		
MUL	64	43		43	50						

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	63	56	27	58	54	55	63	70	100		
FRL	43	42	30	36	42	41	36	52	87		

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	487
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	46
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	45
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	48
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	31
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	60
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	43
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 Quartile Learning Gains; Acceleration; Math Achievement and Learning Gains
2018-2019 saw a major turn over in staff with 20 new teachers on campus.

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

Acceleration- Algebra 1 pass rate decline significantly due to a lost teacher and 6 weeks with a substitute.

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 was 18 points below the state average. This was due to 5/8 teachers being new to teaching/ Osceola County. We had two rooms with substitutes for more than a quarter of the school year in 2019.

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

We were able to maintain social studies achievement and ELA achievement, but we did not make growth. We worked to establish listeracy across all content areas.

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

The high number of level 1 students is concerning. This is our most problematic area.

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

1. ELA Achievement/ Learning gains
2. Math Achievement/ Learning gains
3. Science Achievement/ Learning gains
4. Social Emotional Well being of students
5. Reducing behaviors

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers across all content areas will ensure high levels of grade level literacy for all students. By focusing on literacy in all areas, student achievement will increase.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA Achivement will increase to 50%. ELA Learning gains will increase to 50%. ELA lowest quartile learning gains will increase to 45%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Collin (amy.collin@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All teachers across content areas will increase the amount of time students are reading, writing, and talking in the classroom. Differentiated approaches will occur for ELL, ESE, and multi-racial students. Teachers will align student tasks to the learning target for the day.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	John Hattie, 2010 cites a significant increase in student effect size when students have clear learning goals and the path to learning. 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. ELL Taskforce will assist teachers in the implementation of ELLevation stratgies on a monthly basis in idetifying targeted strategies in the CUPS. (Cintron)
2. Teachers will embed Read, Write, Talk Solve across the content areas.(V. Harris)
3. Teachers plan to Close the Achievement by identifying special populations (ELL, ESE, Multiracial, Lowest Quartile) and targeted strategies in weekly lesson plans. (V. Harris)
4. Achieve 3000 will be monitored weekly for completion of articles at 75% or better. (V. Harris)
5. Literacy Coach models and monitors implementation of engagement with text (marking the text, reflecting on text, answering questions, discussing)(Harris)
6. Provide professional development on district curriculum programs (Core Connections, Achieve 3000) and provide support on implementation of programs (Harris).

Person Responsible	Virginia Harris (virginia.harris@osceolaschools.net)

7. ELA/ Reading PLC's will meet weekly to discuss activities, data, and interventions needed for student success. (Harris)
8. Teachers will embed accommodations and needed interventions for ESE students into their Lesson Plans (Stanley)

Person Responsible	Virginia Harris (virginia.harris@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Ensure all students reach high achievement in Math. By focusing on math instruction, students will increase their performance in math.
Measurable Outcome:	Math Achievement will increase to 50%; Math Learning Gains will increase to 50%; and Math lowest quartile will increase to 45%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Collin (amy.collin@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All teachers across content areas will increase the amount of time students are reading, writing, and talking in the classroom. Differentiated approaches will occur for ELL, ESE, and multi-racial students. Teachers will align student tasks to the learning target for the day.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	John Hattie, 2010 cites a significant increase in student effect size when students have clear learning goals and the path to learning. 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. Implementation of READ/WRITE/TALK/SOLVE will be evident on all math classes, allowing students to process information. (Farrell)
2. SuccessMaker will be used with our Intensive Math students to ensure growth.(Farrell)
3. Digital and Face to Face instruction will be standards based with activities aligned to the standard. (Farrell)
4. Math PLC's will meet weekly to discuss activities, data, and interventions needed for student success. (Farrell).
5. Math Data from NWEA, SuccessMaker, Algebra Nation and district formatives will be analyzed monthly to ensure student success. (Farrell)
6. ELL Strategies will be embedded into the daily lessons (Cintron)
7. ESE accommodations will be embedded into the daily lessons (Stanley).

Person Responsible Matthew Farrell (matthew.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Ensure all students reach high achievement in Science. By focusing on Science achievement, students will be college and career ready.
Measurable Outcome:	Science Achievement will increase to 45%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Megan Gould (megan.gould@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will increase the use of content vocabulary and hands on inquiry based instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	John Hattie, 2010 cites a significant increase in student effect size when students have clear learning goals and the path to learning. 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. Implementation of READ/WRITE/TALK/SOLVE will be evident on all Science classes, allowing students to process information. (Farrell)
2. Inquiry based instruction will be used to engage students in problem solving for Science. (Farrell)
3. Digital and Face to Face instruction will be standards based with activities aligned to the standard. (Farrell)
4. Science PLC's will meet weekly to discuss activities, data and interventions needed for student success. (Farrell).
5. ELL Strategies will be embedded into the daily lessons (Cintron)
6. ESE accommodations will be embedded into the daily lessons (Stanley).

Person Responsible	Matthew Farrell (matthew.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Create a culture where student discipline decreases through the implementation of PBIS.
Measurable Outcome:	Referrals for discipline will decrease by 10% to less than 1000 for the 2020-201 school year .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marc Hernandez (marc.hernandez@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Tier 1 Implementation of PBIS strategies will be evident in the classrooms and the teachers will use restorative practices to build classroom culture.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By improving the classroom culture and utilizing PBIS strategies, student behavior will improve. 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 implement minor infractions for both digital and face to face students with lessons on teaching expectations in the classroom. (Gil)
2. A comprehensive reward system will be in place to encourage students to make good choices face to face and digitally. (Gil)
3. MTSS/ PBIS will meet monthly to ensure Tier 2/3 students have interventions. (Gil/ Hare)
4. Community Circles will be implemented to ensure students have a safe environment. (Gil)

Person Responsible	Marc Hernandez (marc.hernandez@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Create a culture where students' social and emotional needs are met on a daily basis through ongoing supports.
Measurable Outcome:	Threat Assessments for students will decrease by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marc Hernandez (marc.hernandez@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will embed SEL strategies in the classroom in their daily lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By ensuring students emotional well-being is taken care of, students will be able to focus on academic growth. Middle School is emotionally difficult for most students, by providing them with tools to manage stress and emotions, we are giving them skills to manage life tasks. 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. Ensure all teachers understand and know how to merge SEL and ATL skills into their lessons. (Guidance)
2. SEL intervention groups meet to teach students self regulation skills (Guidance)
3. Safety at school and online will be taught to ensure Parkway is a safe learning environment (Guidance).
4. Ensure students feel safe at school and identify at least one trusted adult through know 5 things strategy. (Guidance)
5. Assist teachers with implementing SEL strategies by providing a monthly newsletter. (Guidance)
6. Provide tiered interventions to identified students who present behavior and emotional needs. (Guidance)

Person Responsible	Marc Hernandez (marc.hernandez@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all Students (District Assurances Requirement)	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Ensure a post secondary culture focusing on college & career readiness.By focusing students on being goals for post secondary paths, student achievement and readiness will increase.
Measurable Outcome:	School acceleration will increase to 90% achievement. The number of students applying for rigorous high school programs including IB, Neo City, and Paths will increase by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Collin (amy.collin@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The school will focus on the MYP- IB program and the K-12 progression of IB learning as well as embedding WICOR from AVID school wide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The MYP and AVID programs create a culture of college readiness. 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. MYP Coordinator/ Guidance Team will meet with 7th & 8th graders to ensure they know high school options and the requirements needed. (Da Silva)
2. MYP Coordinator/ Guidance Team will meet with 7th graders in the spring to ensure they know high school options and the requirements needed. (Da Silva)
3. Teachers will be train in MYP framework and strategies to strengthen instructional practices. (Da Silva)
4. Assure the implementation of ATL skills in the classroom to increase best practices and build skills in students for academic success. (Da Silva)
5. PLCs will embed best practices & inquiry practices into their Units. MYP Coach will offer support through attending PLCs, covering classes to allow observations of model teachers, and providing PDs. (Da Silva)
6. Ensure that interested 8th grade students enrolled before January 2021 will participate in the Community projects, with 50% completing projects. (Da Silva)

Person Responsible	Amy Collin (amy.collin@osceolaschools.net)

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Through targeted interventions and support through the MTSS process, students in multiple subgroups will increase their achievement.

Measurable Outcome:	Math Achievement for ESE will increase to 30%. Math Achievement for ELL students will increase to 30%. Math Achievement for Multiracial student will increase to 30%. ELA Achievement for ESE will increase to 30%.ELA Achievement for ELL students will increase to 30%. ELA Achievement for Multiracial student will increase to 30%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marc Hernandez (marc.hernandez@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All teachers across content areas will increase the amount of time students are reading, writing, and talking in the classroom. Differentiated approaches will occur for ELL, ESE, and multi-racial students. Students who need additional interventions and support will be addressed through the MTSS process
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When targeted interventions are provided at the right time, students are able to close the achievement gap. 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. MTSS meets weekly to address subgroup (ELL, ESE, Multiracial) area needs for Tier 2 & 3 in Math/ Reading/ Behavior). (Hare)
2. Intervention Time is used to address specific subgroup needs. (Hare)
3. Data on subgroups is analyzed monthly at Stocktake Meetings and problem solved. (Hare)
4. Teachers will be trained on how to Read and Track BIPs. (Stanley)
5. Keeping student documentation on Focus for accommodations and contact with parents. (Stanley)
6. Teachers will keep track of ESE Students who are refusing accommodations and encourage the use of accommodations. (Stanley)

Person Responsible	Amy Collin (amy.collin@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will monitor other areas through our monthly stocktake process to determine of we need to add additional areas of focus.

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 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 Whal 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 schoolwide 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 underserved 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: Instructional Practice: ELA				$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports				$200.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400		0821 - Parkway Middle School	General Fund		$200.00
			Notes: PBIS Leadership Forum addressing Equity, SEL and PBIS.			
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 (District Assurances Requirement)				$22,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400		0821 - Parkway Middle School	Title, I Part A		$22,000.00
			Notes: MYP Training for teachers			
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				$0.00
					Total:	$22,200.00