

School District of Osceola County, FL

St. Cloud Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	30
Budget to Support Goals	31

St. Cloud Middle School

1975 S MICHIGAN AVE, St Cloud, FL 34769

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Christina Harrell

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2020

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)	65%
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 (61%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	31

St. Cloud Middle School

1975 S MICHIGAN AVE, St Cloud, FL 34769

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	72%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

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

Student Achievement is our #1 Priority.

Provide the school's vision statement.

St. Cloud Middle School strives to be a collaborative group of learners with student achievement being our #1 priority.

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
Harrell, Christina	Principal	in charge of financial, curricular, and instructional resources and decisions
Burda, Nicole	Assistant Principal	in charge of curricular and instructional decisions
Clark, Kyle	Dean	provides 6th-8th grade level discipline and EWS data
Knight, Brandon	Dean	provides 6th-8th grade level discipline and EWS data
Webb, Ashley	Dean	provides 6th-8th grade level discipline, EWS data, state assessment test coordinator
Metz, Dylan	School Counselor	7th Grade Guidance Counselor, 504 & FIT Coordinator - provides focused support of students
Roop, Anastasia	School Counselor	6th Grade Guidance Counselor, 504 & FIT Coordinator and MTSS Coach- provides focused support of students and data collection and analysis, Problem Solving Team Coordinator, liaison with district lead counselor and district MTSS Coordinator for interfacing district policy with MTSS/RTI school implementation.
Rousch, Amy	Assistant Principal	in charge of curricular and instructional decisions
Fontaine, Kevin	Instructional Coach	provides curricular intervention and provides progress monitoring data for district and state assessment
Krebs, Nichole	Instructional Coach	provides curricular intervention and provides progress monitoring data for district and state assessment
Hoffman, Nicole	School Counselor	8th Grade Guidance Counselor, 504 & FIT Coordinator - provides focused support of students
Barley, Carrie	Other	ESE Resource Compliance Specialist:

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2020, Christina Harrell

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.*

7

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.*

36

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

72

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)	65%
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 (61%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: A (65%)
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	425	426	418	0	0	0	0	1269	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	43	38	0	0	0	0	132	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	31	46	0	0	0	0	93	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	9	0	0	0	0	24	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	66	68	0	0	0	0	203	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	67	69	0	0	0	0	215	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	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	28	47	49	0	0	0	0	124

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/9/2020

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	420	415	393	0	0	0	0	1228	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	81	79	0	0	0	0	199	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	105	121	0	0	0	0	316	

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

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

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	43	57	0	0	0	0	152	

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	420	415	393	0	0	0	0	1228	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	81	79	0	0	0	0	199	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	105	121	0	0	0	0	316	

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

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

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	43	57	0	0	0	0	152	

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	55%	45%	54%	57%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	48%	54%	54%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	42%	47%	42%	39%	44%
Math Achievement	63%	49%	58%	59%	48%	56%
Math Learning Gains	57%	51%	57%	59%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	47%	51%	56%	49%	50%
Science Achievement	62%	47%	51%	62%	51%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	72%	72%	85%	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	54%	48%	6%	54%	0%
	2018	52%	46%	6%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	49%	47%	2%	52%	-3%
	2018	54%	46%	8%	51%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	57%	49%	8%	56%	1%
	2018	64%	52%	12%	58%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	54%	45%	9%	55%	-1%
	2018	54%	43%	11%	52%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	22%	30%	-8%	54%	-32%
	2018	31%	29%	2%	54%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
08	2019	63%	47%	16%	46%	17%
	2018	63%	43%	20%	45%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	56%	42%	14%	48%	8%
	2018	46%	42%	4%	50%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	62%	36%	67%	31%
2018	100%	68%	32%	65%	35%
Compare		-2%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	73%	6%	71%	8%
2018	79%	70%	9%	71%	8%
Compare		0%			
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	89%	52%	37%	62%	27%
Compare		4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	44%	52%	57%	39%
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	21	39	34	33	49	40	22	43	75		
ELL	36	45	40	43	56	47	28	61	59		
ASN	72	56		72	72						
BLK	52	49	57	57	53	37	43	83	88		
HSP	48	50	42	56	56	54	53	77	88		
MUL	51	45	20	59	46	55	76	83	80		
WHT	61	54	41	70	58	58	69	82	89		
FRL	46	49	42	56	53	49	48	74	80		
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	15	37	33	23	44	42	11	38			
ELL	18	48	44	28	50	47	26	35			
ASN	70	60		75	60						
BLK	50	55	45	55	58	46	59	83	83		
HSP	54	56	42	55	58	53	47	75	70		
MUL	57	52		59	68		73	73			
WHT	62	62	46	68	66	58	61	83	74		
FRL	51	55	43	54	58	52	45	74	76		
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	9	37	37	16	45	46	20	49			
ELL	20	45	45	39	49	42	35	73			
ASN	76	87		88	79						
BLK	50	47	25	42	61	59	54	81	87		
HSP	53	54	43	55	57	55	51	84	79		
MUL	61	61		68	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	58	53	42	63	59	57	70	85	85		
FRL	50	50	42	55	58	51	58	83	79		

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	59
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	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	591
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
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	45
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	68
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	58
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	56
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	57
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	65
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	54
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.

Overall, ELA Lowest Quartile Achievement has a historical trend of being the lowest performance area. For the 2019 testing season, the data shows an achievement percentage of just 41% showing proficiency, this is 1% lower than the district average, and 6% lower than the state average. If we look at the 2018 makeup of this category, we were 2% above the district average. One possible factor could be that we have seen a high turnover rate in reading teachers, particularly at the 7th grade level. Despite teacher turnover within the ELA department improving during the 2020-21 school year, teacher retention continues to be an area of concern, as we did have turnover in a couple of ELA positions. Another could be the lack of monitoring and proper identification by teachers of their students that fall in the lowest quartile. Another factor is an increased need for the school to improve MTSS processes for our lowest performing students.

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

The area of greatest concern and lowest performance would be ELA Gains overall, with a drastic decrease in gains for our 7th grade population. According to the data, Our ELA Gains have been on the decline for the past 4 years, with an overall decrease of 7 points. Specifically looking at 7th grade scores, we see a 6 point decline since the 2018 scoring period. This places our 7th grade scores below the state average for 2019. When considering the causes of this decline, it must be noted that teacher retention played a significant role in the lack of success with our 7th grade population. Our Intensive Reading 7th grade position was filled more than twice during the school year, and midway through the year had to be collapsed due to lack of ability to fill the role. Teachers on campus absorbed these courses, but with less than half a year to prepare the students, they were unable to recover the teaching time that was lost. Furthermore, across all grade levels, it was noted that rigor and enrichment for our 3s, 4s, and 5s was lacking, which contributed to a decline in ELA Gains for our already proficient students.

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.

As stated previously, the greatest gap would be the ELA Lowest Quartile Achievement. Contributing factors include, but are not limited to, teacher retention concerns, frequent student schedule change requirements, and lack of specific focus on students that fell within this category due to teacher inability (resources and knowledge) to pull the information

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

There were two categories that showed improvement in the 2019 assessment year. The first would be our science achievement scores. In 2018 we saw a drop in science scores from 62% to 55%; however, the 2019 scores show a rebound from this back to a 62% pass rate. While this is news to celebrate, our science scores are still down from the 2016 assessment year which saw a 67% pass rate. The second category of marked success would be acceleration. In 2018 we saw a decline in our acceleration score due to a miscommunication about CTE testing data and therefore our score dropped from an 83% to a 73% in 2018. The 2019 season saw an increase which exceeded the initial drop in score to an 88% acceleration score. Within both of these areas we monitored activities and decisions that would impact the testing environment, ensuring that students were receiving rigorous material and were provided the supports in order to be successful within the course.

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

The two areas of concern that are most important to address in the 2020-2021 school year will be chronic absenteeism and course failure within ELA and Math. After reviewing the data for the 2019 assessment year, we noted that many of our students that failed to show gains or achieve passing scores on the assessments were also students with high absenteeism. Furthermore, we noted that

several students who did not show success also had failing grades in essential tested courses, which correlated with their lack of success on the test.

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

1. ESSA Subgroups (SWD)
2. ELA Gains and Achievement in all categories
3. Math Gains and Achievement in all categories
4. Science Achievement
5. Culture/Social-Emotional Learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	By working to provide high levels of literacy instruction for all students, we can ensure that all students receive the support and guidance necessary to be successful on all end of year assessments.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Goals for 2021 FSA ELA (growth is based on 2018-2019 scores): ESE 24% (6% growth) ELL 11% (4% growth) Lowest Quartile 47% (6% growth) Overall Gains 62% (10% growth) Overall Achievement 62% (7% growth)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nichole Krebs (nichole.krebs@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilize, with fidelity, the district provided electronic resources (Achieve3000, Dibels, School City, CUPs) that have proven to increase student scores and abilities, monitoring growth and providing scaffolding and intervention during PRIDE when necessary to continue to support student achievement in literacy.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When used on a regular basis, Achieve3000 and Dibels have proven to be effective tools for formative assessment and continued student growth, providing resources and strategies that are on the students current lexile level. By requiring that a minimum of 2 articles a week be completed with a score of 75% or higher, we can expose students to continuous practice in literacy and monitor effectiveness. By using our CUPs and School City, we can ensure that guaranteed and viable curriculum is being utilized and also collect current data to continue progressing toward our school goals. Formative assessment is associated with improvements in student learning (Kingston and Nash 2009; Black and Wiliam 1998, Nyquist 2003, Meisels et al. 2003), particularly among low achievers (Black and Wiliam 1998) and students with learning disabilities (Fuchs and Fuchs 1986).

Action Steps to Implement

2. Provide training on Achieve3000, Dibels, utilization of CUPs, and School City to all school personnel.
3. Create a calendar for Laptop Cart utilization to ensure that all literacy teachers have access to the carts on a regular, rotating basis.
5. SWD will receive grade level instruction. The work will be scaffolded to meet their needs and will be supported by the VE teacher when applicable.
6. SWD will receive intervention based on their Tier 3, Tier 2, and Tier 1 individual needs.
8. Teacher delivers daily content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by ensuring standardized lessons and using differentiated instruction for ELL and ESE students. And monitored by the ESOL Compliance Specialist and RCS.
9. Student mastery of standards will be monitored using NWEA.
10. Meet monthly with the leadership team to discuss trends and additional steps that may be needed.

Person Responsible Nichole Krebs (nichole.krebs@osceolaschools.net)

1. Provide the Reading Coach the flexibility to focus strictly on working with teachers to improve student achievement.

4. Monitor teacher and student utilization weekly with walk-throughs and report access, correcting situations that may jeopardize the intended outcome of our actions.

7. Identify students that need additional support in filling content area gaps and ensure they are placed in the appropriate Mustang PRIDE intervention group.

11. Principal and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement.

12. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Person Responsible Nicole Burda (nicole.burda@osceolaschools.net)

13. Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Person Responsible Christina Harrell (christina.harrell@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus	By ensuring that all students receive on level, rigorous, and meaningful math instruction, we can bridge the gap in content knowledge and encourage continued growth in all math assessment areas.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Goals for 2021 FSA Math (growth is based on 2018-2019 scores):</p> <p>ESE 25% (4% growth)</p> <p>ELL 17% (7% growth)</p> <p>Lowest Quartile 61% (6% growth)</p> <p>Overall Gains 65% (8% growth)</p> <p>Overall Achievement 67% (4% growth)</p> <p>Goals for Algebra 1 & Geometry (growth is based on 2018-2019 scores):</p> <p>Algebra 1 pass rate 95% (6% growth)</p> <p>Geometry pass rate 100% (4% growth)</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Fontaine (kevin.fontaine@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilize, with fidelity, the district approved resources (Kagan Strategies, Prodigy, formative assessments, NWEA, School City, CUPs) that have proven to increase student scores and abilities, monitoring growth and providing scaffolding and intervention during PRIDE when necessary to continue to support student achievement in math.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By ensuring that all teachers are utilizing the provided material from the district that has been proven to be effective and viable curriculum, and monitoring the progress of students through standard mastery, we can ensure that all students are receiving rigorous material that pushes them to excel within their math courses. The MAP program is a collection of computer-adaptive assessments in reading, language usage, mathematics, and science that places students on a continuum of learning from pre-grade 3 to grade 10. Each MAP assessment uses a continuous interval Rasch unit (RIT) scale to evaluate student growth and mastery of various subject-area, strand-defined skills (Brandt 2010)

Action Steps to Implement

2. Training on Prodigy, Kagan, NWEA, School City, and CUPs to ensure that teachers have the necessary background knowledge about the programs to ensure student success.
3. Training that targets best practices for ESE and ELL student success within content areas.
6. Use data to identify T2 and T3 MTSS students to engage in remediation programs to fill academic gaps.
7. SWD will receive grade level instruction. The work will be scaffolded to meet their needs and will be supported by the VE teacher.
8. SWD will receive intervention based on their Tier level individual needs.
9. Teacher delivers content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by ensuring standardized lessons and using differentiated instruction for ELL and ESE students.
10. Student mastery of standards will be monitored using NWEA.
11. PLC's will monitor data trends monthly and address areas of concern immediately to ensure continued success.

Person Responsible Kevin Fontaine (kevin.fontaine@osceolaschools.net)

1. Establish a Math Coach position that will strictly focus on providing support, enrichment, intervention, and coaching needed by our instructors.
4. Identify students that need additional support in filling content area gaps and ensure they are placed in the appropriate Mustang PRIDE intervention group.
5. Monitor teacher utilization and effectiveness with practices, providing redirection and encouragement to ensure continued student growth
12. Principal and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement.
13. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Person Responsible Nicole Burda (nicole.burda@osceolaschools.net)

14. Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Person Responsible Christina Harrell (christina.harrell@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: By providing meaningful, rigorous, standards-based instruction in science to all students, we can ensure that all students receive the necessary support and materials to be successful on the FSSA exam.

Measurable Outcome: Science Achievement 68% (6% growth)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kyle Clark (kyle.clark@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilization of district provided resources that ensure depth of standards teaching and best practices are implemented, focusing on using the provided CUPs and resources including utilizing School City, NWEA, DiscoveryEd, and district formative/summative assessments. Intervention during PRIDE will also be used to continue to support student achievement in science.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Utilizing these programs and tools will ensure a guaranteed and viable curriculum is provided for all students to be successful in science. (DeLong, 2011).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide training on the use of School City and training on how to utilize the CUPs and the resources embedded within them.
2. Monitor teacher usage of materials to ensure depth of standard and rigor is evident in all lessons.
3. Provide training on specific ELL and ESE strategies to utilize to ensure all levels of learners receive the same curriculum at the appropriate level.
4. Frequent classroom walkthroughs and monitoring to ensure rigor and proper pacing is occurring.
5. Identify students that need additional support in filling content area gaps and ensure they are placed in the appropriate Mustang PRIDE intervention group.
6. SWD will receive grade level instruction. The work will be scaffolded to meet their needs and will be supported by the VE teacher when applicable.

Person Responsible Nicole Burda (nicole.burda@osceolaschools.net)

7. SWD will receive intervention based on their Tier 3, Tier 2, and Tier 1 individual needs.
8. Teacher delivers daily content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by ensuring standardized lessons and using differentiated instruction for ELL and ESE students. And monitored by the ESOL Compliance Specialist and RCS.
9. Student mastery of standards will be monitored using NWEA.
10. Monthly meetings to disaggregate data and evaluate the effectiveness of strategies, adjusting them as necessary to ensure student success.
11. Principal and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement.
12. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Person Responsible Nicole Burda (nicole.burda@osceolaschools.net)

13. Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Person Responsible Christina Harrell (christina.harrell@osceolaschools.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Every Student Succeeds Act focuses on specific learner subgroups within each tested field so that we can see the areas of disparity within our student population. Analyzing this data allows us to focus on specific subgroups and content areas to ensure that all of our students are succeeding academically in all core content areas. When analyzing this data we noted that our students with disabilities (SWD) fell below the Federal Index of 41% with an achievement rate of 40%, and appeared to have academic concerns across all content areas. Furthermore, every other subgroup had specific areas of great concern which prompted us to focus on our SWD while also identifying areas within each subgroup that should be targeted for student growth. Each of these subgroups are listed in our Measurable Outcome section with specific goals within the assessment area of need.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>ELA Achievement: SWD-25%(4%) MUL-58%(7%) FRL-52%(6%)</p> <p>ELA Learning Gains: SWD-45%(6%) MUL-55%(10%) ASN-70%(14%)</p> <p>ELA Lowest Quartile: SWD-40%(6%) ELL-45%(5%)</p> <p>Math Achievement: SWD-40%(7%) ASN-80%(8%) MUL-65%(6%)</p> <p>Math Learning Gains: SWD-55%(6%) ASN-75%(3%) BLK-60%(7%) MUL-55%(9%)</p> <p>FRL-58%(5%)</p> <p>Math Lowest Quartile: SWD-48%(8%) BLK-50%(13%)</p> <p>Science Achievement: SWD-30%(8%) ELL-35%(7%) BLK-55%(12%) FRL-58%(10%)</p> <p>Social Studies Achievement: SWD-50%(7%) ELL-70%(9%) HSP-81%(4%) FRL-80%(6%)</p> <p>Increase in all other areas and subgroups not specifically mentioned by 2%</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carrie Barley (carrie.barley@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilize, with fidelity, the district provided electronic resources (Achieve3000, Dibels, NWEA, Prodigy, DiscoveryEd, School City, CUPs) that have proven to increase student scores and abilities, monitoring growth and providing scaffolding and intervention during PRIDE when necessary to continue to support student achievement in all content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When used on a regular basis, these programs have proven to be effective tools for continued student growth, providing resources and strategies that are on the students ability level. By using our CUPs, NWEA, and School City, we can ensure that guaranteed and viable curriculum is being utilized and also collect current data to continue progressing toward our school goals (Riedell, 2011).

Action Steps to Implement

2. Training on Prodigy, Kagan, NWEA, School City, and the CUPs to ensure that teachers have the necessary background knowledge about the programs and resources to ensure student success.
3. Training that targets best practices for subgroup student success within content areas.
6. Use data to identify T2 and T3 MTSS students to engage in remediation programs to fill academic gaps.
7. All subgroups will receive grade level instruction. The work will be scaffolded to meet their needs and will be supported by the VE teacher.
8. All subgroups will receive intervention based on their Tier level individual needs.
9. Teacher delivers content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by ensuring standardized lessons and using differentiated instruction for all subgroups.
10. Student mastery of standards will be monitored through NWEA & School City.
11. PLC's will monitor data trends and address areas of concern immediately to ensure continued success.

Person Responsible Carrie Barley (carrie.barley@osceolaschools.net)

1. Establish Coach positions that will strictly focus on providing support, enrichment, intervention, and coaching needed by our instructors.
4. Identify students that need additional support in filling content area gaps and ensure they are placed in the appropriate Mustang PRIDE intervention group.
5. Monitor teacher utilization and effectiveness with practices, providing redirection and encouragement to ensure continued student growth
12. Principal and leadership team will conduct walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement.
13. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Person Responsible Nicole Burda (nicole.burda@osceolaschools.net)

14. Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Person Responsible Christina Harrell (christina.harrell@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>The social and emotional well-being of students is important to ensure they are focused on their education and able to recover from difficult situations and events that arise. When analyzing our Winter 2019 SEL Student Surveys it was noted that only 31% of our students feel that they can recover from a bad mood, and 54% of them felt they could control their moods on a regular basis. These numbers are a critical piece of the conversation as they show students struggle not only to control their emotions, but also to self-recover when events/situations affect their emotional state. When students are not emotionally invested in their learning, they will struggle to focus and retain the information being presented to them. Furthermore, the data shows a startling concern with students abilities to "agree to disagree" on differing opinions. According to the survey data, only 55% of our students felt they could be respectful to someone with a different opinion than their own. Learning to respect the opinions of others is another key area that we need to address for the 2020 school year.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>SEL Survey Data Goals: Emotion Regulation-50% (9% growth) Self-Management-75% (5% growth) Social Awareness-70% (8% growth)</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Nicole Hoffman (nicole.hoffman@osceolaschools.net)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Monthly PRIDE lessons will be taught by teachers focusing on key character traits like respect and integrity. Mental Health Monday's will be correlated to the monthly initiative and include short video clips to be posted on school social media. In order to improve culture, motivational decals will be placed in bathrooms and teacher areas across campus. As part of our kindness initiative, interactive kindness bulletin boards will be placed around campus. We will also implement purpose prep (suicide prevention lessons) and panorama surveys. Counselors will continue to be available for students in crisis, and there will be MTSS social/emotional groups for our T2 and T3 discipline/disruption students. Teaching inclusion and multicultural awareness will also be stressed.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Research suggests that a strong sense of community is important to maintaining a positive educational environment, optimizing engagement, and keeping anxiety levels low, all learning factors that have been shown to enhance student achievement (Germeroth 2020)</p>

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#6. Other specifically relating to School-wide Post Secondary Culture**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Ensure a schoolwide post secondary culture for all students.

Measurable Outcome: Acceleration 93% (5% growth from 2018-2019)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Brandon Knight (brandon.knight@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Increased AVID awareness across campus with a monthly focus on post-secondary opportunities and avenues for student exposure.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By providing opportunities for students to explore post secondary opportunities that are available to them, we will give them more options and expose them to ideas that they may not know exists. Many students do not take the necessary steps during high school to prepare for and enter college because they are not aware of these steps or because they lack the guidance or support needed to complete them (Tierney 2009).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monthly College Awareness and Spirit activity
2. Involvement in College Week in August.
4. Quarterly activities to engage student thinking about post secondary opportunities.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

7. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
6. Principal and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement.

Person Responsible Nicole Burda (nicole.burda@osceolaschools.net)

5. 8th Grade College and Career Fair presented by Junior Achievement in the spring 2020
3. 7th grade involvement in Career Surveys with guidance counselors.

Person Responsible Nicole Hoffman (nicole.hoffman@osceolaschools.net)

8. Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Person Responsible Christina Harrell (christina.harrell@osceolaschools.net)

#7. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: By working to provide high levels of social studies instruction for all students, we can ensure that all students receive the support and guidance necessary to be successful on their end of year assessments.

Measurable Outcome: Goals for 2021 Civics EOC (growth is based on 2018-2019 scores):
 Civics EOC pass rate 86% (7% growth)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ashley Webb (ashley.webb@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilize, with fidelity, the district provided resources (formative/summative assessments, School City, CUPs) that have proven to increase student scores and abilities, monitoring growth and providing scaffolding when necessary to continue to support student achievement in social studies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By ensuring that all teachers are utilizing the provided material from the district that has been proven to be effective and viable curriculum, and monitoring the progress of students through standard mastery, we can ensure that all students are receiving rigorous material that pushes them to excel within their social studies courses. Armed with data and the means to harness the information data can provide, educators can make instructional changes aimed at improving student achievement (Hamilton et al 2009).

Action Steps to Implement

2. Provide training on utilization of formative/summative data, School City, and the CUPs to ensure that teachers have the necessary background knowledge about the programs to ensure student success.
3. Provide specific training to all teachers that targets best practices for ESE and ELL student success within their content areas.
5. SWD will receive grade level instruction. The work will be scaffolded to meet their needs and will be supported by the VE teacher when applicable.
6. SWD will receive intervention based on their Tier 3, Tier 2, and Tier 1 individual needs.
7. Teacher delivers daily content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by ensuring standardized lessons and using differentiated instruction for ELL and ESE students.
8. Monitor data trends monthly and address areas of concern immediately to ensure continued success.

Person Responsible Nichole Krebs (nichole.krebs@osceolaschools.net)

4. Monitor teacher utilization and effectiveness with practices, providing redirection and encouragement to ensure continued student growth.
9. Principal and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement.
10. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Person Responsible Nicole Burda (nicole.burda@osceolaschools.net)

11. Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendents during their half way point check in on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Person Responsible Christina Harrell (christina.harrell@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Student absenteeism and engagement in learning are a continuing concern for our school. Measures were taken during the 2019-2020 school year in order to address one component of chronic absenteeism due to disengagement. We provided teachers with the necessary training to help create a positive and motivating classroom culture. Exceeding 35% direct instruction during a class period is not conducive to motivating students to learn. The instructional coaches facilitated two professional developments targeting active engagement strategies in the 2019-20 school year. SCMS also provided a Kagan PD that provided an extension of the active engagement PD. The instructional coaches will continue to provide more active engagement strategies in the 2020-2021 school year that will provide fresh ideas that keep students on task and engaged.

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.

St. Cloud Middle School holds various parent nights throughout the school year. These parent nights include Open House, technology 411, AVID events and other "workshops" focused on how to help students academically. SCMS uses the FOCUS calendar, School Messenger, Facebook, and Remind 101 to keep parents informed about the upcoming events and activities for students and families. SCMS has shown to have great parent involvement within our fine art programs and athletics. Our Oasis Liaison also works with our parent volunteers to get them plugged into school events and day-to-day activities at the school. SCMS uses FOCUS Gradebook, grade reports (progress and report cards), teacher-parent emails and parent conferences to keep parents informed of their child's academic progress.

Through monthly SAC meetings we are able to get families involved in the decision-making process at school. This allows parents to feel that they are an important part of their child's learning. St. Cloud Middle School also has an active social media account, which allows us to be able to keep families apprised of important school events and information. The school leadership team regularly reviews discipline data to understand where students are being successful and where they need improvement. This information is then shared with the faculty as a whole so they can also be informed. Our master schedule is created with collaborative planning in mind. Teachers are able to work together with their PLCs during their planning time on a weekly basis.

There are also various initiatives put forth by our counseling team that focus on positive traits and mental

health. Students will be introduced to these topics each month during Pride time to help foster a positive school culture. During the month students will also be shown various short clips focused on positive mental health strategies.

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				\$2,376.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0272 - St. Cloud Middle School	General Fund		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Reading Account</i>			
			0272 - St. Cloud Middle School			\$2,376.00
			<i>Notes: SAI Funds-Remediation and Enrichment</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$2,376.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0272 - St. Cloud Middle School	General Fund		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: SAC Purchase of Intensive Math Diagnosis and Intervention System Booklets</i>			
			0272 - St. Cloud Middle School	General Fund		\$2,376.00
			<i>Notes: SAI Funds-Remediation and Enrichment</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$1,056.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0272 - St. Cloud Middle School	General Fund		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Science Account</i>			
			0272 - St. Cloud Middle School	General Fund		\$1,056.00
			<i>Notes: SAI Funds-Remediation and Enrichment</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$1,056.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0272 - St. Cloud Middle School	General Fund		\$1,056.00
			<i>Notes: SAI Funds- Remediation & Enrichment</i>			
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00

6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: School-wide Post Secondary Culture				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0272 - St. Cloud Middle School	General Fund		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Professional Development Opportunities</i>			
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies				\$1,056.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0272 - St. Cloud Middle School	General Fund		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Social Studies Account</i>			
			0272 - St. Cloud Middle School			\$1,056.00
			<i>Notes: SAI Funds-Remediation and Enrichment</i>			
Total:						\$7,920.00