Osceola Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Osceola Middle School

526 SE TUSCAWILLA AVE, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Matthew Koff   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	71%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Marion 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

Osceola Middle School

526 SE TUSCAWILLA AVE, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

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	41%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	40%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

At Osceola, we strive to provide a school environment where differentiated instruction is provided to meet the needs of every student to the best of our ability. We will aim to provide an educational program that is academically challenging; our educational program engages each student by linking curricular content to previous knowledge and experience while remaining exciting enough to promote further exploration of new ideas. We will maximize our use of resources through collaborative partnerships with our community, our business and education partners. Osceola students will be prepared to pursue excellence for tomorrow's challenges.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Osceola Middle School, working with families and the community, will inspire students to reach their personal and academic potential, to become productive, compassionate, and successful citizens

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
Lorick, Amanda	School Counselor	School Counselors develop and carry out programs based on developmental needs of students, needs assessments, and school, district, and state priorities. Counselors communicated goals and services of the counseling programs to school administration, staff, students, and parents. School Counselors provide personal/growth counseling including individual and/or group to promote academic success. School counselors are members of the school based leadership team and are actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process.
Collins, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal of Curriculum (APC) is responsible for curriculum related matters and overseeing the guidance department. The APC works alongside the principal to teach and support the teachers as they work through implementing the best strategies possible in the classrooms. The APC is a consistent presence in the classroom by offering support and nonjudgmental feedback. The members of the school based leadership team are all actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process. The assistant principals meet frequently with the school psychologist, social worker, school counselor, specific teachers at problem solving meetings to re-visit data from students struggling at each Tier of instruction. Resources and interventions are assigned and monitored at the PST meetings. Appropriate direct instruction and computer software are utilized for both remediation and enrichment. Parents are notified of progress through progress reports, email, and parent conferences.
Koff, Matthew	Principal	The Principal designs and implements a professional development plan which focuses on maximizing use of strategies to foster standards based instruction. The Principal ensures that members of the school based leadership team are all actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process. The principal actively discusses student data from Tier 1 progress monitoring tools with teachers in order to track effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction.
Price , Carrie	Dean	Student Service Managers (SSM) assist in the development of guidelines for proper student conduct and disciplinary policies and procedures that ensure a safe and orderly environment. They maintain comprehensive files on each student requiring disciplinary action and maintain these records for audits. SSM review and analyze data to implement strategies with parents, students, and teachers to facilitate student behavior change. Student Service Managers are members of the school based leadership team and are actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process.
Panitzke, Robert	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal of Discipline (APD) is responsible for overseeing the Student Service Department and facilities. The APD works alongside the principal to teach and support the teachers as they work through implementing the best strategies possible in the classrooms. The APD is a consistent presence in the classroom by offering support and nonjudgmental feedback. The members of the school based leadership team are all actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process. The assistant principals meet frequently with the school psychologist, social worker, school counselor, specific teachers at problem solving meetings to re-visit data from students struggling at each Tier

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		of instruction. Resources and interventions are assigned and monitored at the PST meetings. Appropriate direct instruction and computer software are utilized for both remediation and enrichment. Parents are notified of progress through progress reports, email, and parent conferences.
Schooley, Morgen	School Counselor	School Counselors develop and carry out programs based on developmental needs of students, needs assessments, and school, district, and state priorities. Counselors communicated goals and services of the counseling programs to school administration, staff, students, and parents. School Counselors provide personal/growth counseling including individual and/or group to promote academic success. School counselors are members of the school based leadership team and are actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Matthew Koff

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.*
4

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.*
18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
56

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	71%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (59%)

2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	333	346	328	0	0	0	0	1007
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	26	29	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	22	19	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	1	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	18	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	41	53	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	69	58	0	0	0	0	178

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	6	19	23	0	0	0	0	48

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	6	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/11/2020

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	312	323	0	0	0	0	940
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	31	41	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	10	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	32	15	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	81	65	0	0	0	0	216

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	105	117	147	0	0	0	0	369

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	5	1	4	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	13	0	0	0	0	33

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	312	323	0	0	0	0	940
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	31	41	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	10	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	32	15	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	81	65	0	0	0	0	216

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	105	117	147	0	0	0	0	369

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	5	1	4	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	13	0	0	0	0	33

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	61%	49%	54%	63%	45%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	54%	54%	60%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	46%	47%	46%	36%	44%
Math Achievement	69%	54%	58%	65%	47%	56%
Math Learning Gains	68%	58%	57%	65%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	50%	51%	53%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	65%	46%	51%	67%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	70%	72%	81%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	60%	45%	15%	54%	6%
	2018	62%	44%	18%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	58%	46%	12%	52%	6%
	2018	58%	43%	15%	51%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	63%	50%	13%	56%	7%
	2018	64%	49%	15%	58%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	62%	46%	16%	55%	7%
	2018	56%	42%	14%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	61%	49%	12%	54%	7%
	2018	55%	49%	6%	54%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	60%	41%	19%	46%	14%
	2018	58%	43%	15%	45%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	64%	44%	20%	48%	16%
	2018	65%	46%	19%	50%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

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

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	65%	7%	71%	1%
2018	78%	64%	14%	71%	7%
Compare		-6%			

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	100%	54%	46%	61%	39%
2018	100%	57%	43%	62%	38%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	51%	47%	57%	41%
2018	100%	54%	46%	56%	44%
Compare		-2%			

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	23	35	29	30	57	50	32	44			
ELL	37	53	46	57	64	57	30	50			
ASN	70	74		80	84						
BLK	25	37	39	33	50	47	37	62	43		
HSP	52	51	41	67	67	63	55	56	77		
MUL	46	53	50	64	83		45	71			
WHT	72	60	50	77	71	59	73	81	77		
FRL	45	49	44	55	63	57	53	65	57		

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	25	45	41	35	47	34	24	44			
ELL	22	55	50	33	67	58		45			
ASN	78	47		83	78						
BLK	33	43	35	34	48	38	33	45	38		
HSP	50	53	54	57	64	50	59	82	46		
MUL	62	62	54	66	73	58		75			
WHT	71	58	44	73	67	53	73	83	65		
FRL	44	49	41	48	57	45	48	68	45		
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	13	28	26	26	51	52	17	46			
ELL	11	36	33	16	44	48					
ASN	70	61		74	72						
BLK	33	44	40	29	50	48	38	58	27		
HSP	55	53	27	58	62	54	55	74	43		
MUL	48	43		56	54		75		36		
WHT	72	66	55	74	69	58	76	87	51		
FRL	41	49	40	47	58	53	49	66	17		

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	64
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	637
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	51
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	77
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
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	59
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	59
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	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

Student learning gains in the bottom quartile for ELA is the lowest reported category. In this category, OMS has a 3% increase from the previous year. There was more of a focus on Data Analysis and identifying individual students needs from the previous year. Across the board our ELA data continues to remain flat from previous years.

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

Student proficiency in Civics declined 6% from the previous year for all students that took the Civics EOC at OMS. For students that calculated into the school grade OMS declined by 3% from the previous school year. There is a 4 year trend that Civics has declined at OMS, with the greater decline coming this school year. This past school year a new textbook was used as a resource to teach the state standards. In addition, there was a first year Inclusion support teacher working with ESE students in the Civics course.

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.

All data components met or exceeded the state average in proficiency. ELA bottom twenty-five percentile had a 1% gap from the state average. In this category, OMS has a 3% increase from the previous year. There was more of a focus on Data Analysis and identifying individual students needs from the previous year. In one ELA sixth grade classroom this year OMS had a continuous sub for the second half of the year, Several sections of this substitutes day were supported sections with an ESE inclusion teacher.

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

Osceola Middle School improved by 11% in both Math Learning Gains for the bottom twenty-five percentile and in Middle School acceleration points. In Math, there was more of a focus on Data Analysis and identifying individual students needs from the previous year. There was a new experienced teacher in 7th grade Mathematics that had the majority of students make learning gains. In addition, a new Assistant Principal to Osceola Middle had a strong background in mathematics and was able to collaborate and share her expertise with OMS Math teachers. There was a targeted approach to identify the strength of our Math teachers and utilize their talents in strategic scheduling of students. Several Math teachers offered after school assistance to students needing support.
In acceleration points, there were more students that took Algebra 1 and Geometry than in previous years and had a success rate of 100% proficiency and 98% proficiency respectively.

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

Osceola met all categories with the exception of students with disabilities which did not meet the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index. There is still a need to make sure our Students with abilities have appropriate IEPs that reflect their needs and appropriate accommodations that will help them be more successful. More collaboration time for teachers of ESE students, ESE support teachers, and self contained teachers will be added in the 2019-2020, 2020-2021 school year.

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

1. Increase gains in Language Arts Proficiency and Learning Gains.
2. Students with Disabilities
3. Civics Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Although Language Arts Proficiency and ELA learning gains mirror or exceed the state average, it continues to be a major area of focus for OMS. We had significant changes in staff during the year with a teacher leaving mid-year and a Reading teacher moved to another area. During the previous school year, there was a significant drop in proficiency and learning gains. We know improving student success in ELA will improve other areas of focus including civics and students with disabilities.
Measurable Outcome:	If OMS increases student engagement in meaningful and thoughtful work, then language arts proficiency, learning gains and bottom quartile learning gains will increase by 3% as measured by FSA
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matthew Koff (matthew.koff@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Dagget System of Effective Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Osceola Middle School is in year 3 of a focus on the Daggett System of Effective Instruction. Last year there was a focus on Building Relationship and Data Driven Instruction. We will continue to build upon the success we had last year by having a 29 point increase in our school grade moving Osceola Middle to an A school. Continuing to work on Relationships and Data driven Instruction will continue, but a focus on making the content more relevant and rigorous will increase student achievement

Action Steps to Implement

1. Instructional Focus will be shared with all staff during teacher pre-plan week.
2. The First Wednesday of each month teachers will collaborate and analyze student work samples.
3. Training on Focused Note Taking and Collaborative Scoring will take place on Early Release Days
4. Brief classroom visits will be conducted by administration to focus on engagement strategies on meaningful and thoughtful work with technology integration. Teachers will be selected to share their engagement strategies the first Wednesday of each month in the Faculty Focus Meetings.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Collins (stephanie.collins@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with Disabilities are still an area in which improvement is needed based upon the most recent ESSA data received. It is the only category in which Osceola Middle School did not reach the 41% target set by the Federal index.
Measurable Outcome:	If inclusion teachers collaborate and plan effectively with general education teachers, then students identified with a federal index below 41% (students with disabilities) will increase from 38% to 41% as measured by ESSA Federal Index
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robert Panitzke (robert.panitzke@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Inclusion teachers will support ESE students in the main stream classroom. These inclusion teachers will be subject specific allowing for more collaboration and plan time with the general education teachers. One paraprofessional will support students in the self contained classrooms taught by two teachers. In addition, monthly meetings will take place between all teachers of ESE students, inclusion teachers, and self contained teachers to analyze data and help determine best practices in meeting each students individual needs. All teachers will be using effective teaching practices in focusing on student engagement in meaningful and thoughtful work.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Osceola Middle School is in year 3 of a focus on the Daggett System of Effective Instruction. Last year there was a focus on Building Relationship and Data Driven Instruction. We will continue to build upon the success we had last year by having a 29 point increase in our school grade moving Osceola Middle to an A school. Continuing to work on Relationships and Data driven Instruction will continue, but a focus on making the content more relevant and rigorous will increase student achievement. Additional collaboration time with monthly meetings with ESE teachers will allow students to discuss individual student needs and focus on effective strategies to increase learning gains and/or bring students to proficiency in all state assessed subjects

Action Steps to Implement

1. Strategic Scheduling of ESE students in placement of classes and specific teachers.
2. Include an ESE inclusion teacher in team leader meetings and training associated with the ICLE.
3. Set up a monthly meeting schedule that allows for collaboration of all teachers that teach ESE students.
4. Share best practices in student engagement in meaningful and thoughtful work throughout the school year.

Person Responsible   Matthew Koff (matthew.koff@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Civics Instruction Osceola Middle School has experienced a two year decline in Civics Proficiency on the statewide assessment. Osceola proficiency has always exceeded the state average in proficiency, however that gap is decreasing and this past year we only exceeded the state proficiency average by 1%.
Measurable Outcome:	If OMS increases student engagement in meaningful and thoughtful work, then Civics proficiency will increase by 3% as measured by the end of Course Civics Assessment
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karen Cox (karen.cox@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Osceola Middle School Instructional focus for the 2019-2020, 2020-2021 school year, is student engagement in meaningful (relevancy) and thoughtful work (relationships). Teachers will be working towards using a gradual release model to help students take more ownership of the learning process. Teachers will be working individually and collaboratively to look at the relevancy of the work assigned and the level of student thinking that went into the student work produced. Instructional strategies will include Artistic Expression, Digital Media Production, Instructional Technology, Service Learning, Worked Based Learning Note-taking/Graphic Organizers, Brainstorming, Summarizing, Learning Centers, Summarizing, Presentations/Exhibitions, and Problem Based and Service Learning
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Osceola Middle School is in year 3 of a focus on the Daggett System of Effective Instruction. Last year there was a focus on Building Relationship and Data Driven Instruction. We will continue to build upon the success we had last year by having a 29 point increase in our school grade moving Osceola Middle to an A school. Continuing to work on Relationships and Data driven Instruction will continue, but a focus on making the content more relevant and rigorous will increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. 2020-2021 Adjustment in teachers who will be teaching Civics.
2 Instructional Focus will be shared with all staff during teacher pre-plan week.
3 The First Wednesday of each month teachers will collaborate and analyze student work samples.
4. Brief Classroom visits will be conducted by admin to focus on engagement strategies on meaningful and thoughtful work. Teachers will be selected to share their engagement strategies the first Wednesday of each month in the Faculty Focus Meetings

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Osceola Middle School will work to address the social-emotional needs of all students by implementing the Start with Hello Campaign and a Save the Promise Club.

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.

Osceola Middle School is not a Title 1 school.

Parents are encouraged to participate in their child's education through membership in our Parent Teacher Organization (PTO). The PTO sponsors several activities designed to unite all stakeholders in activities for the betterment of the school. Our School Advisory Committee (SAC) is another avenue for parent participation in shaping the way business is conducted at OMS. We have an extensive number of well published opportunities for parent volunteers to take an active role in the day to day operations of the school.

New parents are first exposed to the school through a series of orientation meetings that offer information and address questions or concerns. We use the district automated phone calling system and as an avenue for parent communication. Additionally we send home newsletters both quarterly and during the summer months to keep parents up to date and informed about school business. Our school website is updated regularly, as well as teacher web pages.

Parents are also invited on campus for Awards Assemblies, Honor Society Inductions, musical performances, and other special events.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**