Narcoossee Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Narcoossee Middle School

2700 N NARCOOSSEE RD, Saint Cloud, FL 34771

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Francisco Rivera Mieles

Start Date for this Principal: 8/18/2021

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)	52%
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: A (64%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: 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	

* 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

Narcoossee Middle School

2700 N NARCOOSSEE RD, Saint Cloud, FL 34771

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	52%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	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.

Our #1 priority is student achievement with high expectations being the responsibility of our entire community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Everything we do is solely for the students; we believe we can teach all students and that all students will learn given the appropriate resources.

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
Weeden, Gary	Principal	Oversees all school operations including instruction, safety and evaluations.
Stewart, Jared	Assistant Principal	Scheduling, observations, Stock Take facilitator
Smalling, Marisha	Reading Coach	Point person for implementing reading plan on campus
Alexander, Jennifer	Math Coach	Coach for math, monitor math curriculum and assessments. NWEA test coordinator
Schneider, Lucille	Assistant Principal	School discipline, facilities, operations, and employee evaluations

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 8/18/2021, Francisco Rivera Mieles

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.*
20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

75

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,320

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

11

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

11

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	416	456	448	0	0	0	0	1320
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	189	216	267	0	0	0	0	672
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	25	25	0	0	0	72
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	69	58	0	0	0	0	188
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	64	42	0	0	0	0	188
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	22	29	0	0	0	0	71

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	20	22	29	0	0	0	0	71

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/14/2021

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	415	402	399	0	0	0	0	1216
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	30	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	415	402	399	0	0	0	0	1216
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	30	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				62%	45%	54%	62%	47%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	48%	54%	60%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	42%	47%	46%	42%	47%
Math Achievement				65%	49%	58%	66%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains				60%	51%	57%	61%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	47%	51%	58%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				62%	47%	51%	62%	48%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				86%	72%	72%	86%	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	60%	48%	12%	54%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	57%	47%	10%	52%	5%
Cohort Comparison	-60%					
08	2021					
	2019	64%	49%	15%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison	-57%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	55%	45%	10%	55%	0%
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	33%	30%	3%	54%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2021					
	2019	67%	47%	20%	46%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	56%	42%	14%	48%	8%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	62%	38%	67%	33%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	86%	73%	13%	71%	15%

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	79%	49%	30%	61%	18%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	98%	44%	54%	57%	41%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

NWEA for Math, Science and Reading.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	304	325	320
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	34	40
	Students With Disabilities	23	25	20
	English Language Learners	15	12	12
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	304	325	320
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	35	25
	Students With Disabilities	21	23	11
	English Language Learners	9	16	12

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	320	315	310
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	35	40
	Students With Disabilities	25	26	25
	English Language Learners	15	12	13
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	136	148	151
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	29	15
	Students With Disabilities	13	18	12
	English Language Learners	8	13	23
Civics	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	306	325	320
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	48	38
	Students With Disabilities	32	22	23
	English Language Learners	18	18	15
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	305	325	320
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	50	38
	Students With Disabilities	32	28	21
	English Language Learners	0	36	23
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45	44	49
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	18	33	30	23	37	32	14	35	53		
ELL	33	45	37	35	40	36	23	52	58		
ASN	89	78		92	61		93	90	100		
BLK	54	56	38	51	43	32	48	63	62		
HSP	52	51	37	48	45	39	47	73	72		
MUL	75	67		81	63						
WHT	66	55	43	66	51	44	67	86	88		
FRL	43	46	34	41	40	36	37	68	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	30	51	49	35	54	53	27	56	63		
ELL	40	53	46	45	52	44	22	65	69		

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	88	73		88	64		67	89	89		
BLK	57	56	48	59	59	61	53	86	79		
HSP	58	58	50	60	57	49	56	83	76		
MUL	54	71		48	58						
WHT	66	59	45	70	63	57	70	88	75		
FRL	49	54	49	53	56	49	49	74	76		

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	29	55	48	36	51	39	30	64			
ELL	25	53	48	39	53	49	16	62			
ASN	74	63		87	89		78	73	90		
BLK	54	51	46	49	56	50	48	75	80		
HSP	56	58	47	60	57	55	47	82	77		
MUL	71	63		63	58						
WHT	68	62	43	72	63	63	75	91	82		
FRL	55	56	45	58	56	58	53	81	77		

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	32
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	538
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	39
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	86
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	50
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	50
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	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	63
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	45
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?

The biggest trend that was concerning was learning gains among all subgroups in ELA. This is especially true of Hispanic, ESE and ELL students. Lowest Quartile gains dropped in both Math and ELA.

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

ELA Achievement, gains and Lowest quartile gains all fell the most and need the most improvement. ESE is a subgroup that showed significant drops as well.

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

Online learning was a big factor. We must address Social Emotional Learning and Culturally Relevant Instruction in order to build back skills that were lost during the pandemic. Students not feeling connected to the school has had an impact on academics. Through the use of Character Strong and other SEL strategies we will increase number of students who feel connected.

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

Acceleration. The Algebra pass rate went up in 2021.

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

A bigger focus on supporting students who did not have the foundational skills in Math. These students were supported in a way that they gave them the skills they missed in 7th grade.

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

We are ensuring that grade level curriculum is taught to all students in Tier 1. Interventions during the day, before school and after school will help fill gaps for students who are not meeting expectations at Tier 1.

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.

AVID training will be provided to all teachers who are not currently trained. WICOR strategies will be monitor across campus to ensure that engaging strategies are being utilized.

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

Tier 2 and 3 interventions will be provided four days each week during WIN period. The students receiving these interventions will be monitoring closely. Beable for Reading and Success Maker for Math will utilized as supplemental sources during intervention to help fill gaps in foundational skills.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	the leadership tams helps to maintain a cohesive school vision and strategy focused on student achievement. Improvement in this areas, rather than the operational management of a school is the main priority of leadership teams. Effective instructional leadership teams are powerful levers for making change in schools. These teams typically include the principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches, teacher leaders, and other school leaders and can provide a systematic way for schools to execute their most important priorities.
Measurable Outcome:	Insight survey retention section 2020-21 Opportunities to pursue leadership roles
Monitoring:	Retention for 2020-2021 to 2021-2022 Decrease turnover rate from 9.09% to 5%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase teachers leadership roles within the school. Leadership roles can improve teacher motivation and confidence in their own abilities and have taught them to motivate, lead and encourage other autls leading to improved self-confidence, increased knowledge and an improved attitude to teaching among teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Leaders understand that teachers know what their students- and they themselves- need to succeed. When teachers are involved in examining data and making important decisions based on data that inform how they continuously improve their schools, leadership teams can ensure that everyone in the building is focused on the core business of the school-improving student learning outcomes. When teachers work together in teams, they coach each other, learn from each other, and become experts in specific areas. this team dynamic-in which everyone plays a role and is valued-provides them with a safe space to refine their practices to improve student outcomes. It also boosts teacher morale, making it more likely that good teachers will stay in the profession longer.

Action Steps to Implement

Strategic planning will move away from classic approaches to adaptive ones. Shifting away from making predictions, collecting data, and executing from the top down- and towards conducting experiments (such as small 30 day projects). using pattern recognition and execution by the whole.
Create 30 day improvement strategies that actualize the annual goals. The 30 day period is intentional because it forces urgency but leaves enough time change implementation if not working.
Select team so it has a balance visionaries and integrators

Person Responsible	Gary Weeden (gary.weeden@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Feedback is critical to growth in any profession. New teachers and experienced teachers benefit from specific feedback and coaching from leaders on campus. The leadership will use evaluations and NEST instrument to give targeted feedback to teachers. The feedback will focus on being reflective and conversational in nature rather than instructive. The teachers voice must part of the feedback since they are often the ones who know best how to improve. By using feedback questions that cause teachers to reflect and make their own decisions, instruction will improve and student achievement will increase.
Measurable Outcome:	Currently, 7 are highly effective in statewide VAM. We will increase to 12.
Monitoring:	Trend data using the NEST instrument will be reviewed at monthly Stock Take meetings to monitor the use of high impact strategies that have been the focus of schoolwide initiatives as well as targeted feedback.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gary Weeden (gary.weeden@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Principal will be trained as SAM principal with specific coaching for giving teacher feedback. Principal will then train leadership team on best practices learned. Principal will walk through classrooms with members of team to practice feedback and build fidelity of feedback and NEST tool.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Not only will principal improve his practice and give more effective feedback. He will modeling that all staff needs PD and grow in their professional practice.

Action Steps to Implement

Train all leadership team in use of NEST instrument. At least visit per day by an administrator. Include coaches when visiting to help them become familiar with the process and the evidence for each element.

Person Responsible Gary Weeden (gary.weeden@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math proficiency dropped from 65% in 2019 to 56% in 2021. Productive action is needed to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of Math achievement for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal for the year is to increase Math proficiency by 10%
Monitoring:	Review of NWEA scores at fall, winter and spring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Alexander (jennifer.alexander@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff will teach higher level thinking skills through the delivery of differentiated lessons
2. Instructional coaching will be provided in the use of manipulatives and the use of cornerstone tasks that move from concrete to abstract.
3. Teachers will be trained in implementation of the BEST standards and mathematical thinking. Evidence will be collected using the NEST tool (WICOR)
4. Teachers will meet weekly to collaborate in PLC's to plan and evaluate data to drive instruction and interventions
5. Leadership will monitor the use CUPs and the pace of lessons to ensure that all students have access to high quality Tier 1 instruction at grade level. Evidence will be analyzed using NEST tool and NWEA student Achievement data

Person Responsible	Jennifer Alexander (jennifer.alexander@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on FSA data proficiency in ELA dropped from 62% in 2019 to 58% in 2021.
Measurable Outcome:	The outcome for 2022 is to increase proficiency by 5%
Monitoring:	Data from NWEA and formative assessments will be monitored throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jared Stewart (jared.stewart@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that analyzing student assessment data plays a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative data produces learning gains for all students including SWD. MTSS and differentiation also has a great effect on achievement
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will have ongoing PD on implementing the BEST standards and using the CUP. Ongoing training on student engagement strategies will be ongoing and monitored using the NEST instrument.
2. Emphasis will put on small group instruction and PD for this strategy will provided
3. Teachers will meet in collaborative PLC's on a weekly basis to analyze formative and summative data and to make adjustments to Tier 1 and 2 instruction
4. Tier 1 instruction will be closely monitored using the NEST instrument to ensure that teachers are adhering to the CUPs so that all students are accessing grade level standards
5. Instructional coaching will focus on engagement strategies

Person Responsible	Marisha Smalling (marisha.smalling@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science achievement dropped from 62% proficiency in 2019 to 56% proficiency in 2021
Measurable Outcome:	Proficiency in Science will increase by 6%
Monitoring:	Data will be monitored using formative assessments given throughout the year and NWEA data measured in fall, spring and winter
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jared Stewart (jared.stewart@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Science curriculum must be relevant to students. The lessons must matter to students and give opportunities to solve complex problems.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When students are more engaged they increase their learning. Science is most engaging when it is relevant and causes students to think beyond recall of facts and terms.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will meet weekly in PLC to analyze assessment data from formative and summative assessments
2. Common planning will be utilized to ensure that all teachers are delivering the guaranteed and viable curriculum.
3.Teachers will meet weekly in PLC to analyze assessment data from formative and summative assessments
4. Teachers will provide individual data chats with students
5. Teachers will visit the classrooms of other Science teachers to share strategies and make their own instruction more engaging.

Person Responsible   Jared Stewart (jared.stewart@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Well implemented SEL programs are associated with positive outcomes including better test scores and improved social behavior. SEL competencies include collaboration and responsible decision making. It also builds resiliency and builds good academic habits. A positive climate includes a safe environment and strong relationships between students and staff. It also includes academic, behavior and emotional supports for students.
Measurable Outcome:	On the Spring 2021 Panorama survey favorable answers on student teacher relationships dropped from 72% to 59% when compared with Fall 2020 survey. Through focused SEL strategies we will increase to 75% favorable on the Spring 2022 survey.
Monitoring:	Data will be taken in the fall Panorama as well as numerous surveys done throughout the year to gauge student morale.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are diverse in needs. It is essential to assess individual learning styles and be flexible in time management to allow for e meeting different needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	SEL is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student centered. They use techniques that build on student's current knowledge and skills.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students. Identifying and building on student's interests.
2. Teachers will increase student input and voice through planning and reflective activities.
3. Character Strong lessons will be used in WIN and integrated into all classes.
4. The leadership/MTSS team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop interventions as required.
5. Teachers will facilitate collaborative learning in classes.

Person Responsible	Gary Weeden (gary.weeden@osceolaschools.net)

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on data from 2019, ELL achievement in math was 24% and 16% in Reading. ESE achievement in Math was 28% and 28% in ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	Using strategies specifically to increase achievement in these subgroups will see gains of 5 points in Math for each of these subgroups and 5 points in Reading for each of these subgroups.
Monitoring:	These subgroups will be monitored closely by PLC's and Leadership on NWEA and content specific formative assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jared Stewart (jared.stewart@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all students
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiation balances academic content and student individual needs. Instruction can be modified using four different elements: Content- Information that must be learned Process- How students make sense of content Product- How students demonstrate what they learned Affect- The feelings and attitude that affect learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PLC's will develop common assessments for all students
2. Teachers will develop learning targets for all students.
3. Students will participate in targeted Tier 2 and 3 interventions
4. Teachers will participate in PD for WICOR strategies
5. Teachers will participate in instructional rounds or strategy walks to learn new differentiation strategies for delivering content.

Person Responsible	Jared Stewart (jared.stewart@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Violent incidents and property incidents were very low with drug incidents being low. The biggest area of concern was the middle rating for suspensions. We will review suspension data monthly at MTSS meetings as well as at PBIS meetings. By focusing on SEL strategies in lessons we will increase the student sense of belonging in the school as measured by Panorama. When students feel more connected to the school and at least one adult on campus they are less likely to engage in social behavior that can result in suspensions. We are also implementing restorative discipline for infractions whenever possible. By looking for ways to have students make retribution for behavior that harms others we will not only limit suspensions and time out of class but also build empathy and concern for others. This approach will make it much more likely that behaviors do not reoccur. Additionally, we are looking to improve campus wide procedures. Instituting more supervision in the morning and at passing time when incidents are more likely to occur. Also, providing support for teachers who are seeing more code of conduct infractions in their classes will decrease the number of referrals that occur in the classroom. Finally, Tier 3 interventions for students who receive multiple suspensions will be implemented during WIN time. These interventions will include mentoring, leadership training and the Why Try curriculum.

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.

NCMS is a PBIS school. PBIS is our Tier 1 program for behavior. Through PBIS we are engaging students, staff and parents in creating a culture that focuses on teaching expectations, reteaching expectations and recognizes students and staff who regularly meet those expectations. This is in contrast to a culture that looks to change behavior through punishment. By getting feedback from students, parents and staff on what is working and what is not working we look to continuously improve our system. Additionally, NCMS is an AVID School. AVID creates a college going atmosphere and incorporates WICOR into all classes. WICOR is a tool that increases engagement in all classes. When students are engaged in lessons where they are able to collaborate and use higher order thinking skills like reading, writing and inquiry, they are likely to be more empathetic and connected to school. Academic achievement is a by product of this student centered approach.

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

Parents, students and staff will be recruited to be part of the PBIS team.
Leah Boyd is the PBIS Coach and Lucile Schneider is the administrator over PBIS

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development					$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22	
	1000	520-Textbooks	0040 - Narcoossee Middle School	General Fund		$500.00	
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback					$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math					$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA					$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science					$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning					$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups					$0.00
						Total:	$500.00