
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	30
Budget to Support Goals	31

Horizon Middle School

2020 HAM BROWN RD, Kissimmee, FL 34746

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Megan Gould

Start Date for this Principal: 1/4/2017

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	81%
2020-21 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 (56%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	31

Horizon Middle School

2020 HAM BROWN RD, Kissimmee, FL 34746

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	71%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	84%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Horizon Middle School strives to develop self- confident and creative students willing to take risks within a challenging and innovative environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Horizon Middle School is committed to preparing ALL students to be college and career ready.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ballone, Michael	Principal	Instructional leader - Leads the shared decision-making process along with the administrative team and the school's leadership team to address data, interventions, and school-based decisions. Promotes a schoolwide culture of learning through the PLC and the MTSS processes.
Hebbler, Deanna	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader - Participates in the shared decision-making process along with the administrative team and the school's leadership team to address data, interventions, and school based decisions. Develops and Manages the school master schedule. Responsible for conducting monthly Stocktake meetings to monitor the progress of the school improvement plan.
Anakotta, Keith	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader - Participates in the shared decision-making process along with the administrative team and the school's leadership team to address data, interventions, and school based decisions. Leads the school wide PBIS process and he is the administrator overseeing testing.
Hinds, Jacqueline	Reading Coach	Literacy coach - provide small group intervention and instruction coaching support.
Wold, Andrea	Instructional Coach	MTSS coach - provide small group intervention and instruction coaching support. Facilitate the MTSS process at Horizon. Facilitate WINGS (intervention time).
Holbrook , Elizabeth	Math Coach	Math/Science coach - provide small group intervention and instruction coaching support.
Vecchio, Vincent	Dean	Provide behavioral support and campus supervision. Participate in the collection of behavior data and managing interventions.
Agluiar, Angela	Dean	Provide behavioral support and campus supervision. Participate in the collection of behavior data and managing interventions.
Seecharran, Lincoln	Dean	Provide behavioral support and campus supervision. Participate in the collection of behavior data and managing interventions.
Summers, Heather	School Counselor	Provide SEL support and resources to our students. Assist in providing college and career opportunities. Crisis response and intervention for our students.
Mangrum, Naivasha	School Counselor	Provide SEL support and resources to our students. Assist in providing college and career opportunities. Crisis response and intervention for our students.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Baba, Georgina	School Counselor	Provide SEL support and resources to our students. Assist in providing college and career opportunities. Crisis response and intervention for our students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 1/4/2017, Megan Gould

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

55

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

92

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,334

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

14

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

12

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	409	443	447	0	0	0	0	1299
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	124	103	0	0	0	0	253
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	131	109	0	0	0	0	349
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	136	118	0	0	0	0	392
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4

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	10	46	29	0	0	0	0	85

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/27/2021

2020-21 - 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	129	211	227	0	0	0	0	567
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	34	41	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	19	38	0	0	0	0	88
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	69	135	0	0	0	277
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	34	73	0	0	0	147

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	1	0	0	0	0	2

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	6	4	12	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

2020-21 - 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	129	211	227	0	0	0	0	567
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	34	41	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	19	38	0	0	0	0	88
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	69	135	0	0	0	277
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	34	73	0	0	0	147

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	1	0	0	0	0	2

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	6	4	12	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				47%	45%	54%	47%	47%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	48%	54%	53%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	42%	47%	45%	42%	47%
Math Achievement				53%	49%	58%	49%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains				57%	51%	57%	58%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	47%	51%	56%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				50%	47%	51%	50%	48%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				74%	72%	72%	75%	75%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	45%	48%	-3%	54%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	44%	47%	-3%	52%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
08	2021					
	2019	44%	49%	-5%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	47%	45%	2%	55%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	26%	30%	-4%	54%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
08	2021					
	2019	54%	47%	7%	46%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	43%	42%	1%	48%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	98%	62%	36%	67%	31%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	73%	73%	0%	71%	2%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	84%	49%	35%	61%	23%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	97%	44%	53%	57%	40%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

NWEA

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	93	144	161
	Economically Disadvantaged	66	98	111
	Students With Disabilities	1	4	12
	English Language Learners	21	25	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	103	151	121
	Economically Disadvantaged	70	106	82
	Students With Disabilities	4	7	4
	English Language Learners	16	23	23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	77	179	211
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	116	144
	Students With Disabilities	3	7	9
	English Language Learners	16	35	48
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	104	154	136
	Economically Disadvantaged	69	103	87
	Students With Disabilities	2	5	1
	English Language Learners	15	32	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	145	204	210
	Economically Disadvantaged	90	124	131
	Students With Disabilities	5	8	5
	English Language Learners	12	21	22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	112	147	137
	Economically Disadvantaged	66	89	83
	Students With Disabilities	6	6	3
	English Language Learners	11	16	18
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	121	149	172
	Economically Disadvantaged	77	102	115
	Students With Disabilities	9	12	15
	English Language Learners	24	20	32

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	22	34	27	24	39	39	33	44			
ELL	22	37	37	31	44	55	24	36	79		
ASN	67	52		70	32		74	83	88		
BLK	36	43	48	31	42	62	33	59	59		
HSP	39	43	39	40	44	58	47	62	72		
MUL	45	41		22	22		40				
WHT	51	54	36	52	41	46	65	73	79		
FRL	37	42	38	38	44	55	45	59	72		
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	26	38	31	29	48	44	14	41			
ELL	31	42	35	36	54	67	21	51	63		

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
ASN	71	69		73	59		65	86	85		
BLK	39	42	37	49	54	41	43	68	82		
HSP	45	50	35	49	57	62	43	71	71		
MUL	46	42		50	63		44	77	90		
WHT	55	56	39	63	61	53	70	84	89		
FRL	41	47	34	49	57	55	41	69	69		
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	18	39	33	22	49	45	19	32			
ELL	20	42	38	26	56	56	17	40	82		
ASN	70	58		74	76		64	92	100		
BLK	44	46	47	43	57	64	46	80	81		
HSP	45	54	44	46	57	57	46	72	81		
MUL	41	54		38	32		38	45			
WHT	54	56	45	58	60	46	66	80	81		
FRL	44	54	45	46	57	49	45	70	79		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
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	30
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	482
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	67
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	34
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

After reviewing the data, Horizon students dropped in all areas, in all grades (1%-15% decrease), except for ELA lowest 25th percentile, which increased to 39%, which is still not sufficient.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math achievement (-12%), Math Learning Gains (-15%) and Social Studies (-9%) achievement had the greatest drop.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

SEL, Covid fear, digital learning, attendance and engagement
High SEL focus, improvement in Tier 1 instruction, assessment cycles, continued focus on PLC process, intentional intervention placement for all subjects (WINGS)

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA Lowest 25th percentile

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Small group instruction, rotations, increase in Tier 1 instruction in reading classes, PLCs began analyzing data to inform instruction, student data chats

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Quality tier 1 instruction, student data chats, PLC data analysis, using data to drive instruction, flexible grouping, targeted interventions planned by PLCs, lesson studies, coaching cycles, ongoing PLC guidance, walkthroughs, trend walks

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Ongoing PLC training, new teacher mentoring, data PDs, lunch and learns, extra hour PLC, differentiation PD

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Constant monitoring PLC stages, monitoring interventions, new teacher mentoring, trend walks, walkthroughs

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The leadership team at Horizon maintains the culture and climate of the school to ensure that all students are demonstrating success. According to our 2020-2021 Insight survey, staff identified professional development as an opportunity for improvement. By increasing leadership capacity, we can provide the professional development opportunities that the teachers are requesting.

Measurable Outcome: The results of the insight survey for the 2021-2022 school year will increase by 5% for the opportunities for professional developments.

Commit to Monthly Stocktake Process

Monitoring: Leadership Team will track and provide progress on action items relating to school improvement and problem solve through barriers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michael Ballone (michael.ballone@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Increase teacher leadership roles within the school Leadership roles can improve teacher motivation and confidence in their own abilities. It taught them to motivate, lead and encourage other adults leading to improved self-confidence, increased knowledge, and an improved attitude to teaching among teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Great leaders understand that teachers know what their students, and what they, themselves, need to succeed. When teachers are involved in examining data and making important decisions based on data that inform how they continuously improve their schools, leadership teams can ensure that everyone in the building is focused on the core business of the school which is improving student learning outcomes. When teachers work together in teams, they coach each other, learn from one another, and become experts in specific areas.

Action Steps to Implement

School Level Leadership Development
 Focus on Developing Non-Classroom Leadership Team Members
 Focus on Developing Leadership through PLC Leads and the Horizon Preparing New Leaders Teacher Program

Person Responsible Michael Ballone (michael.ballone@osceolaschools.net)

Data Disaggregation and Monitoring
 Review Data at Stocktake Meetings
 Create Action Items specific to School Improvement and Instructional Support

Person Responsible Michael Ballone (michael.ballone@osceolaschools.net)

Teacher targeted feedback
 Provide Specific and Timely Feedback to All teacher on a weekly basis

Person Responsible Michael Ballone (michael.ballone@osceolaschools.net)

Non-Evaluative School Trend Instrument (NESTI Walkthrough Tool)
 Collect Trend Data from weekly walkthroughs

Person Responsible Michael Ballone (michael.ballone@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Given the 2021 FSA data, only 42% of students are proficient in reading (decrease of 5%); 45% of students made a learning gain (decrease of 6%) and 39% of our lowest 25% made a learning gain (increase of 3%)
 Improve Tier I instruction in English Language Arts (ELA). High quality Tier 1 instruction when delivered to students should impact the proficiency levels of students. When Tier 1 instruction is effective, 80% of students are proficient on assessment measures. Based on data only 42% of students were proficient on the State Assessment.

Measurable Outcome: ELA proficiency will increase from a 42% to 52% on the 2022 FSA.
 ELA Learning Gains will increase from 45% to 56% on the 2022 FSA.
 The lowest 25% ELA Learning Gains will increase from 39% to 50% on the 2022 FSA.

Monitoring:
 -ELA proficiency and learning gains will be monitored by NWEA and progress monitoring.
 -Marzano's Framework: Standards-Based Planning, Standard-Based Instruction, and Conditions of Learning.
 -B.E.S.T. Standards
 -Foundational Skills
 -BEABLE

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. PLC from each grade level will discuss benchmarks and identify teaching points
2. Use NWEA, BEABLE, formative assessments data to develop instructional plans for interventions during Tier 1 instruction (Wise & Kuhfeld, 2020)
4. Utilize research-based practices/strategies to deliver Tier 1 instruction (Marzano, 2003)
5. The Stocktake process will take place monthly to assess progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus
6. Coaching cycle

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Discuss benchmarks and identify targets or teaching points- impacts clarity for students and teachers
2. Analyze students' quantitative and qualitative data- to determine specific learning needs of students; develop instructional plan to meet needs; and evaluate effectiveness of the instruction students receive (Where are we now?)
3. Marzano Instructional Strategies- great effect size, has positive impact on students' learning where utilized
4. ELA Expectations to fully engage students while processing curriculum content
5. Stocktake - analyze data; determine next steps; evaluate plans for effectiveness
5. Instructional Coaching-.help teachers develop repertoire of strategies to deliver effective Tier 1 instruction

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborative planning/professional Learning Communities - Weekly Collaborative meetings during planning, Extra Hour PLC to analyze data, develop reteaching plans, lesson Study to identify a problem of practice, plan, execute, and evaluate to refine teaching practice, continue to build PLC capacity to move along PLC stages

Person Responsible Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

Differentiation - Plan differentiated lessons based on student's readiness level, Small group instruction based on needs (foundational skills), SWD will receive scaffolded work, utilize NWEA data to develop instruction plans and interventions, ELL and ESE strategies will be embedded into daily lessons.

Person Responsible Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional Coaching - implementation of Coaching Cycles, Instructional Walkthroughs with feedback, Modeling instruction, Trend Walk with Admin to identify specific needs

Person Responsible Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

Graduation - Implementation of AVID Strategies school wide

Person Responsible Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

Professional Learning - Pocket PDs based on teacher need, Extra Hour PLC with targeted tasks to meet student needs, Lesson Study

Person Responsible Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

Small Group instruction - Rotation model used in Intensive reading/research classes, Phonological Awareness Assessments and Intervention, Fluency Intervention

Person Responsible Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

Standards Aligned Instruction - Clear learning goals and targets based on BEST standards, Task and target alignment, Rigorous learning goals (BEST Standards) , Use Marzano's Deepening strategies to deepen learning

Person Responsible Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices (Rigor, Expectations, Engagement), Language and literacy skills , Flexible grouping of students with targeted interventions, Intentional teaching

Person Responsible Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

Tier 2 & 3 Instructional Intervention Practices - Schoolwide Intervention (W.I.N.G.S) that are created based on student needs with targeted instruction from data, Phonological Awareness, Fluency, Spelling Inventory and Intervention

Person Responsible Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Given the 2021 FSA data, only 41% of students are proficient in math (decrease of 12%); 42% of students made a learning gain (decrease of 15%) and 56% of our lowest 25% made a learning gain (decrease of 2%)
 Improve Tier I instruction in Math. Implementation of Marzano's teaching map cycle: Standards-Based Planning, Standard-Based Instruction, and Conditions of Learning. PLCs data analysis of common assessments will provide guidance and support for students in Tier 2 and 3 (Dufour, 2010; Marzano, 2003).

Measurable Outcome: Increase achievement levels in mathematics from 41% to 58%
 Increase learning gains in mathematics from 42% to 62%
 Increase lowest quartile learning gains in mathematics from 56% to 63%

Monitoring: Math proficiency and learning gains will be monitored by NWEA and progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. PLC teams from each grade level will unpack essential standards and identify learning targets that most closely address the standards. (Dufour, 2010)
2. Use NWEA data to develop instructional plans for interventions during Tier1 instruction (Wise & Kuhfeld, 2020)
3. Increase the use of WICOR strategies in all math classes
4. Utilize Marzano high yield, research-based practices/strategies to deliver Tier 1 instruction (Marzano, 2017)
5. The Stocktake process will take place monthly to evaluate/monitor progress and update the Principal on the Area of Focus

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Unpacking standards and identifying learning targets will provide clarity for students and teachers which will result in more effective instruction and greater student achievement
2. Analyze students' quantitative and qualitative data- to determine specific learning needs of students; develop instructional plan to meet needs; and evaluate effectiveness of the instruction students receive (Where are we now?)
3. Implement WICOR strategies to fully engage students while processing curriculum content
4. Marzano Instructional Strategies- great effect size, has positive impact on students' learning where utilized
5. Instructional Coaching- help teachers develop repertoire of strategies to deliver effective Tier 1 instruction

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborative Planning/Professional Learning Communities: math PLC teams will continue to build efficacy in stage 6 of the PLC process while moving toward stage 7

Person Responsible Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Differentiation: SWD will receive grade level instruction with scaffolded work to meet their needs. Utilize NWEA data to develop instructional plans for interventions during Tier 1 instruction, Use of Hands2Mind manipulatives and lessons, ELL and ESE strategies will be embedded into daily lessons.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional Coaching: Implementation of coaching cycles, mini PD's, walk-throughs with focused areas of observation.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Graduation (Middle & High school): Implementation of AVID strategies school-wide.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Small Group Instruction: Use NWEA data to develop instructional plans for interventions during Tier 1 instruction, Use of Hands2Mind manipulatives and lessons to increase student engagement.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Standards Aligned Instruction: Math coach will conduct 'standards-based' observations in order to monitor and offer support toward the implementation of standards aligned instruction that have cognitive processes at the same level as cognitive complexity addressed within essential standards.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices (Rigor, Expectations, Engagement): Use of WICOR, Utilize Marzano instructional framework to deliver Tier 1 instruction that is scaffolded to meet student needs.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Tier 2 & 3 instructional intervention practices: Success Maker, WINGS interventions, Meet with math PLC teams to make instructional decisions based on data analysis of common assessments and NWEA MAP growth assessments

Person Responsible Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Given the 2021 FSA data, only 49% demonstrated proficiency (decrease of 1%)
 Improve Tier I instruction in Science. Implementation of Marzano's teaching map cycle: Standards-Based Planning, Standard-Based Instruction, and Conditions of Learning. PLCs data analysis of common assessments will provide guidance and support for students in Tier 2 and 3 (Dufour, 2010; Marzano, 2003).

Measurable Outcome: Increase achievement levels in science from 49% to 55%

Monitoring: Science proficiency will be monitored by NWEA and progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. PLC from each grade level will unpack essential standards and identify learning targets that most closely address the standards (Dufour, 2010)
2. Use NWEA data to develop instructional plans for interventions during Tier 1 instruction (Wise & Kuhfeld, 2020)
3. Make WICOR practices more evident in all science classes
4. Utilize Marzano's high yield, research-based practices/strategies to deliver Tier 1 instruction (Marzano, 2017)
5. The Stocktake process will take place monthly to evaluate/monitor progress and update the Principal on the Area of Focus

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Unpacking standards and identifying learning targets will provide clarity for students and teachers which will lead to more effective instruction and achievement
2. Analyze students' quantitative and qualitative data- to determine specific learning needs of students; develop instructional plan to meet needs; and evaluate effectiveness of the instruction students receive (Where are we now?)
3. Incorporate WICOR strategies to fully engage students while processing curriculum content
4. Marzano Instructional Strategies- great effect size, has positive impact on students' learning where utilized
5. Instructional Coaching: to help teachers develop repertoire of strategies to deliver effective Tier 1 instruction

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborative Planning/Professional Learning Communities: Science PLC teams will continue to build efficacy in stage 6 of the PLC process while moving toward stage 7.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Differentiation: SWD will receive grade level instruction with scaffolded work to meet their needs. Utilize NWEA data to develop instructional plans for interventions during Tier 1 instruction, Use of Hands2Mind manipulatives and lessons, ELL and ESE strategies will be embedded into daily lessons.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional Coaching: Implementation of coaching cycles, mini PD's, walk-throughs with focused areas of observation.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Graduation: Implementation of AVID strategies school-wide.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Professional Learning: Principal and Leadership team will conduct walkthroughs of PLC team meetings to ensure correct processes are being used in the analyzing and planning for student achievement.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Small Group Instruction: Utilize NWEA data to develop instructional plans for interventions during Tier 1 instruction

Person Responsible Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Standards & Aligned Instruction: Science coach will conduct 'standards-based' observations in order to monitor and offer support toward the implementation of standards aligned instruction that have cognitive processes at the same level as cognitive complexity addressed within essential standards.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices (Rigor, Expectations, Engagement): WICOR, Utilize Marzano instructional framework to deliver Tier 1 instruction, WINGS Enrichment

Person Responsible Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Tier 2 & 3 Instructional Intervention Practices: Meet with science PLC teams to make instructional decisions based on data analysis of common assessments and NWEA MAP growth assessments

Person Responsible Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In reviewing the Social Emotional Learning data collected through the Panorama Student survey 2020/21, it was noticed that out of the students surveyed, 39% chose favorably to School Belonging This area of focus has a significant impact on both student academic and behavioral success at Horizon Middle School. Identifying this critical component is critical in understanding our student body and culture of the school. With a better understanding of the school culture, students and staff will have the necessary tools to increase their success.

Measurable Outcome: According to the Panorama student survey data, 60% (from 39%) of students will respond favorably to having a sense of belonging at Horizon Middle School.

Monitoring: Progress monitoring by administering the Panorama survey and work on the action plans as identified in the sub categories below.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Georgina Baba (georgina.baba@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Deliver Panorama survey to students, examine data around school belonging.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: There is a positive correlation between a sense of belonging at school and improved academic achievement and discipline data. Aspects of a positive school climate will lead to a safer environment and stronger student and staff relationships that support learning (Gennari, Meloniuo, & Rizvi, 2017)

Action Steps to Implement

Social Emotional Learning

1. Identify students in need of support
2. Social Emotional Learning. SEL lessons during WINGS throughout the year meeting in small groups typically twice a week for 30 minutes each session.
3. In addition to the small WINGS groups, teachers will utilize Character Strong lessons at various points throughout the year based on grade level to build classroom culture.

Person Responsible Sol Lopez (sol.lopez@osceolaschools.net)

Community and Parent Involvement

1. College and Career Fair is open to parents and local businesses to showcase their talents. Community members and parents are invited to share with students what they do.
2. Parents involved in child's education and mental health through safety and health plans, communication via phone, and various Remind messages.
3. PBIS is hosting a parent night with information and resources for parents dealing with struggling students, both in academics and/or behavior.

Person Responsible Heather Summers (heather.summers@osceolaschools.net)

Positive Behavior Intervention and Support

As a part of school-wide MTSS, the PBIS committee has developed a variety of Tier II interventions to support student behavioral needs. Students are selected for Tier II Interventions via discipline data or

teacher referral.

1. Students displaying at-risk behavior are placed in "Flight School", which is an SEL developed curriculum based on Casel's framework with a focus on self-regulation and goal setting.
2. Check & Connect is a mentor program that targets ESE students needing Tier II or Tier III behavior supports.
3. Our Eagle mentor program targets an additional 30 students with 1:1 relationships monitored by student services.
4. Provide professional development to PBIS committee members around culturally responsive teaching strategies. Committee members will then facilitate trainings to PLCs.
5. Deans will conduct classroom walkthroughs using PBIS observation tool to monitor environment, reinforcement, and management of expectations.

Person Responsible Vincent Vecchio (vincent.vecchio@osceolaschools.net)

Equity and Diversity

1. Celebrate the various cultural months/days which will include but not be limited to: Hispanic Heritage Month (Sept/Oct), Black History Month (February), Pride (May), Different-abled people (April - Autism Awareness Month)
2. Halloween Trick o Treat with self contained classes.
3. Compare the equity portion of Panorama data from 2020-2021 to 2021-2022 surveys to determine improvement and any areas of growth.

Person Responsible Naivasha Mangrum (naivasha.mangrum@osceolaschools.net)

Schoolwide Post Secondary Culture for all students

1. College T-shirt days throughout the school year, College and Career Fair in collaboration with AVID, College & Career Week,
2. Xello lessons will be given by teachers. By utilizing Xello, that will lead to the 4 E's (enroll, enlist, employ, and explore)
3. Highlight a college, career or military branch through the morning announcements

Person Responsible Georgina Baba (georgina.baba@osceolaschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ESSA data showed in 2018-19 that the school had one subgroup (ESE) below the ESSA level of 41%. The data analysis show the need to improve learning gains for student with disabilities (SWD) and English Language Learners (ELLs)

Measurable Outcome: SWD will increase ELA achievement level from 33% to 41%, learning gains will increase from 38% to 41%, and SWD lowest quartile learning gains will increase from 33% to 41%.
 SWD will increase Math achievement level from 33% to 41%, learning gains will increase from 48% to 51%, and SWD lowest quartile learning gains will increase from 44% to 47%.
 ELL students will increase ELA achievement level from 44% to 49%, learning gains will increase from 44% to 49%, and ELL students lowest quartile learning gains will increase from 44% to 49%.

ELL students will increase mathematics achievement level from 44% to 49%, learning gains will increase from 44% to 49%, and ELL students lowest quartile learning gains will increase from 44% to 49%.

Monitoring: NWEA, Progress monitoring, data chats, small group interventions

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jonathan Torres (jonathan.torres@osceolaschools.net)

- Evidence-based Strategy:**
1. Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all their students.
 2. Integration of Guiding Coalition research and action items that will ensure PLCs address the needs of SWDs and ELLs
 3. PLC Assessment Cycle & Use of Learning strategies as immediate error analysis and instruction in specific standards (Dufour, 2010)
 4. Implementation of Check & Connect Mentor program for ESE students(Sinclair, Christenson, & Thurlow, 2005).
 5. Better co-teach model for push-in support facilitation teachers (Murawski, 2009)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers understand how students learn at different rates therefore, it is imperative to ensure SWDs and ELLs are receiving a guaranteed curriculum and students are learning at high levels (Marzano, 2009).

Action Steps to Implement

Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups - ELL Task Force, Small group intervention periods for ELL and ESE students with their case manager, learning strategies, targeted MTSS groupings, and lessons

Person Responsible Andrea Wold (andrea.wold@osceolaschools.net)

Progress monitoring and disaggregating of data - MTSS team targeted interventions/disaggregating of data, NWEA monitoring, data chats,

Person Responsible Andrea Wold (andrea.wold@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional practices (rigor, engagement, and differentiated classroom) -Clear learning goals and targets, Task and target alignment, Rigorous learning goals (BEST Standards in ELA/Reading), Use Marzano's Deepening strategies to deepen learning, CUPS,

Person Responsible Andrea Wold (andrea.wold@osceolaschools.net)

Professional Learning Communities - Reviewing PLC stages and providing interventions for PLCs based on needs of each PLC, Weekly meetings, Lunch and learns with coaches

Person Responsible Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

Equity and Diversity - culturally relevant materials, relating material to real life, teacher training (warm demander), data analysis

Person Responsible Naivasha Mangrum (naivasha.mangrum@osceolaschools.net)

MTSS Instructional Intervention Practices - targeted intervention groups (data driven), teacher input on instruction during intervention time, MTSS meetings weekly with leadership, MTSS meetings with staff, teacher referral program, continual review of MTSS and data analysis to ensure interventions are working or if need to be modified, continuous cycle to ensure student success

Person Responsible Andrea Wold (andrea.wold@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

According to safeschoolsforalex.org, Horizon Middle reported 0.8 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the Statewide middle/junior school rate of 4.2 incidents per 100 students. One of our goals is to increase school belonging and SEL awareness which will reduce the number of discipline referrals while increasing academic performance.

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.

As part of our school-wide MTSS program, the PBIS team, with administration, facilitated professional development in how to build strong and lasting relationships with students during pre-planning. This session covered the strategies for building relationships, building classroom community, and the importance of positive, specific behavioral praise as part of our school-wide PBIS implementation. The PBIS committee is

also being transformed into a problem-solving committee focused on improving Tier I culture and environment as well as Tier II behavior intervention.

1. Students are selected for Tier II Interventions via discipline data or teacher referral.
2. Students displaying at-risk behavior are placed in "Flight School", which is an SEL developed curriculum based on Casel's framework with a focus on self-regulation and goal setting.
3. Our Check & Connect program targets "at-risk" ESE students with monitored 1:1 mentor/student relationships.
4. Our Eagle mentor program targets an additional 60 students with 1:1 relationships monitored by student services.
5. Provide professional development to PBIS committee members around culturally responsive teaching strategies. Committee members will then facilitate trainings to PLCs.
6. Deans will conduct classroom walkthroughs using PBIS observation tool to monitor environment, reinforcement, and management of expectations.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The PBIS committee is made up of admin, the MTSS coach, school counselor, teachers, and a member of the community (a parent and PTSO member). M. Ballone, Administrator (principal); V. Vecchio, PBIS Point of Contact; A. Wold, PBIS Content Knowledge Expert; V. Vecchio, A. Aguiar, & L. Seecharran (deans), PBIS Data Entry/Retrieval; K. Casey (teacher), PBIS Facilitator; J. Overcash (parent), M. Nuzzi (teacher), D. Doron (teacher), & J. Waite (teacher) PBIS Stakeholder voice

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00