

School District of Osceola County, FL

# Neptune Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>25</b>

# Neptune Middle School

2727 NEPTUNE RD, Kissimmee, FL 34744

www.osceolaschools.net

## Demographics

Principal: Thomas Rademacher

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (57%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>25</b>

# Neptune Middle School

2727 NEPTUNE RD, Kissimmee, FL 34744

www.osceolaschools.net

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	83%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	85%

## 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.

Excellence for all . . . whatever it takes.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Education which inspires all students to achieve their highest potential.

### 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
Crisp, Kara	Assistant Principal	In charge of ensuring students are in the appropriate classes through master scheduling. Oversees the MTSS process, PLC process, and Science Goals. Prepares the stocktake process with each subject area lead to ensure Neptune continues to move forward.
Rademacher, Thomas	Principal	The principal oversees the vision and mission of the school. Assigns the roles and responsibilities of the leadership team to ensure the SIP is being monitored. Conducts a monthly stocktake to monitor the SIP and make adjustments based on the data.
Wilson, Lisa	Math Coach	In charge of the math goal. Supports the Math PLC to ensure students are being supported on all levels and monitors progress towards the math goals.
Rosario, Kacie	Instructional Coach	Tracking each PLC as they move through the 7 stages. Serves as the MTSS Coach. Ensures the elective team is progressing through the PLC process. Supports all new teachers with instruction and certification.
Lovegrove, Alexandria	Reading Coach	In charge of the literacy goal and ensuring literacy is school wide. Supports the ELA PLCs to ensure students are being supported on all levels and monitors progress towards the literacy goals.
Franceschi, Frankie	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal that oversees leadership goals, culture and environment goals, SEL, SS/Civics, and Title 1.

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 8/1/2018, Thomas Rademacher

**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**

61

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,009

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

2

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

20

**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	326	324	359	0	0	0	0	1009
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	63	81	0	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	11	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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



Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	0	0	0	0	16

**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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	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	300	333	357	0	0	0	0	990
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	72	58	0	0	0	0	198
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	72	59	0	0	0	0	187

**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	39	41	47	0	0	0	0	127

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	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	300	333	357	0	0	0	0	990
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	72	58	0	0	0	0	198
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	72	59	0	0	0	0	187

**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	39	41	47	0	0	0	0	127

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	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				52%	45%	54%	50%	47%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	48%	54%	48%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	42%	47%	39%	42%	47%
Math Achievement				55%	49%	58%	50%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains				58%	51%	57%	53%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	47%	51%	49%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				52%	47%	51%	52%	48%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				81%	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	50%	48%	2%	54%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	52%	47%	5%	52%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
08	2021					
	2019	45%	49%	-4%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	53%	45%	8%	55%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	23%	30%	-7%	54%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
08	2021					
	2019	44%	47%	-3%	46%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	42%	42%	0%	48%	-6%
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	79%	73%	6%	71%	8%

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	93%	49%	44%	61%	32%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	44%	56%	57%	43%

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

NWEA Progress Monitoring Tool

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	96/45%	119/44%	146/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	45/42%	51/38%	67/45%
	Students With Disabilities	7/20%	5/11%	8/17%
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	100/43%	107/38%	102/35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42/37%	43/31%	40/27%
	Students With Disabilities	4/12%	4/9%	2/4%
	English Language Learners	18/25%	21/24%	14/15%

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	148/53%	145/45%	147/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	59/42%	67/40%	62/34%
	Students With Disabilities	5/12%	3/6%	2/4%
	English Language Learners	19/26%	20/22%	20/20%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	106/36%	123/38%	105/32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	45/31%	52/30%	41/24%
	Students With Disabilities	4/9%	5/10%	4/8%
	English Language Learners	13/16%	20/22%	14/15%
	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	163/50%	185/55%	177/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	64/44%	78/49%	71/44%
	Students With Disabilities	6/19%	13/33%	14/36%
	English Language Learners	17/24%	24/30%	23/27%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	102/30%	161/45%	165/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/21%	65/39%	64/39%
	Students With Disabilities	3/8%	5/12%	9/21%
	English Language Learners	9/12%	22/27%	18/21%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	149/56%	154/55%	169/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	61/48%	66/47%	70/50%
	Students With Disabilities	13/41%	16/40%	17/45%
	English Language Learners	31/44%	27/35%	35/43%

**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	28	44	37	29	40	36	35	64			
ELL	25	45	45	28	41	40	31	73	65		
ASN	79	76		79	65		100				
BLK	44	49	38	44	37	33	50	89	92		
HSP	46	51	47	47	46	42	53	83	77		
MUL	62	56		57	50						
WHT	63	55	45	67	57	55	78	95	89		
FRL	41	47	43	42	41	38	52	83	76		
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	24	51	45	28	48	47	28	55			
ELL	30	47	46	34	49	52	21	57	77		

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	65	62		81	58		58	85	100		
BLK	46	54	46	41	59	61	33	88			
HSP	49	53	49	51	56	52	50	77	90		
MUL	58	60		56	74		53	93			
WHT	64	60	49	72	66	76	66	91	94		
FRL	47	53	46	49	56	54	46	78	90		
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	20	35	25	19	42	45	15	28			
ELL	19	37	38	21	37	40	16	44	36		
ASN	68	55		80	67		80				
BLK	46	43	40	43	56	43	59	85	67		
HSP	44	47	40	45	49	47	45	71	63		
MUL	63	50		50	59		57	75			
WHT	67	52	31	67	62	69	66	80	79		
FRL	46	46	35	46	52	48	47	71	64		

### 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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	561
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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%	
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	67
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	51
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?

SWD students lacking proficiency in ELA and Math.

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

SWD students learning gains and proficiency.

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

Difficulty supporting digital SWD students with accommodations and supports. All students are face to face and ensuring that they are receiving supports and scaffolding.

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

1. ELA lowest 25%.

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

We separated our ELA and Reading teachers and focused on Tier 1 instruction in those areas.

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

Reading and Math interventions through WIN. Acceleration of lowest 25% through Intensive Reading and Intensive Math.

#### 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.

Professional Development facilitated by academic coaches and district support coaches in Numeracy Project, Success Maker, Beable, and Achieve programs.

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

Support for all level 1 Math students through Intensive Math. Support for all level 2 Math students in WIN. Support for all level 1 Reading students through Intensive Reading and WIN.

## 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 helps to maintain a cohesive school vision and strategy focused on student achievement. Improvement in this area, 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. It was found through the Insight survey submitted by teachers that there was a need for growth in instructional leadership.

**Measurable Outcome:** Insight Survey Retention Section Response 2020-21  
Opportunities to pursue leadership roles 15% 2020-2021 20% in 2021-2022

**Monitoring:** Insight Survey Responses for 2021-22  
Opportunities to Pursue Leadership Roles 2021-22 Survey

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Frankie Franceschi (frankie.franceschi@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Increase teachers leadership roles within the school leadership teams can improve teacher motivation and confidence in their own abilities and had 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 need 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- improving student learning outcomes. When teachers work together in teams, they coach each other, learn from one another, 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. In these collaborative environments, transparency of practice and data are expected to help drive improvement (Gates Foundation 2019).

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. School Level Leadership Development - Leadership Cadre
2. Data Disaggregation and Monitoring - Stocktake
3. Teacher Targeted Feedback - Assigned Subject Area PLC Admin
4. Non-Evaluative School Trend Instrument (NESTI Walkthrough Tool) - Utilize Data

**Person Responsible** Frankie Franceschi (frankie.franceschi@osceolaschools.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Given the 2019 -2020 school data finding that only 55% of students were proficient in math, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematics achievement for all students.

**Measurable Outcome:** The outcome for 2021-22 is to increase math proficiency by 4%.

**Monitoring:** NWEA Data

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Lisa Wilson (lisa.wilson@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 assessments 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:** Studies show that 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 assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010)

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Collaborative Planning/Professional Learning Communities - Math Coach will attend grade level PLCs and help with data desegregation, backward planning, common assessments and guidance on curriculum.
2. Differentiation, Small Group Instruction, Tier 2&3 Instructional Interventions - Utilize Successmaker and Numeracy Project data to differentiate students into groups for tier 2 & 3 interventions.
3. Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning - Math Coach will conduct coaching cycles to determine needs for professional development and followup with classroom walkthroughs to monitor implementation.
4. Standards Aligned Instruction - PDs given on Best Standards and CUPs to ensure standards aligned instruction.
5. Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices (Rigor, Expectations, Engagement) - WICOR strategies used in instruction as well as cornerstone tasks embedded in the CUPs.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Wilson (lisa.wilson@osceolaschools.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on the 2018- 2019 and 2019-2020 school data, ELA proficiency 52%, which is below the state average of 55%. The district average is 47%, however, the goal is to increase above state average of 55% while focusing all ELL, ESE, Black, Hispanic, and FRL students.

**Measurable Outcome:** The outcome for 2020-2021 is to increase ELA proficiency by 4%.

**Monitoring:** NWEA data

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Alexandria Lovegrove (alexandria.lovegrove@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Studies show that 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 MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003).

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Collaborative Planning/Professional Learning Communities - Reading Coach will attend grade level PLCs and help with data desegregation, backward planning, common assessments and guidance on curriculum.
2. Differentiation, Small Group Instruction, Tier 2&3 Instructional Interventions - Utilize Beable and Achieve data to differentiate students into groups for tier 2 & 3 interventions. Tier interventions utilizing Words Their Way.
3. Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning - Reading Coach will conduct coaching cycles to determine needs for professional development and followup with classroom walkthroughs to monitor implementation.
4. Standards Aligned Instruction - PDs given on Best Standards and CUPs to ensure standards aligned instruction.
5. Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices (Rigor, Expectations, Engagement) - WICOR strategies used in instruction as well as cornerstone tasks embedded in the CUPs.

**Person Responsible** Alexandria Lovegrove (alexandria.lovegrove@osceolaschools.net)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Science education has been to cultivate students' scientific habits of mind, develop their capability to engage in scientific inquiry, and teach students how to reason in a scientific context. Science allows students to explore their world and discover new things. It is also an active subject, containing activities such as hands-on labs and experiments. This makes Science well-suited to active younger children. Science is an important part of the foundation for education for all children.

**Measurable Outcome:** In 2018-2019 science achievement was 52% In 2021-2022 student achievement will increase by 4%.

**Monitoring:** NWEA data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kara Crisp (kara.crisp@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The Science curriculum must be made relevant to students by framing lessons in contexts that give facts meaning, teach concepts that matter in students' lives, and provide opportunities for solving complex problems.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students who manipulate scientific ideas using hands-on/minds-on strategies and activities are more successful than peers who are taught by teachers relying primarily on lecture and the textbook (Lynch & Zenchak, 2002)\_

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Collaborative Planning/Professional Learning Communities - Admin over Science will attend grade level PLCs and help with data desegregation, backward planning, common assessments and guidance on curriculum.
2. Differentiation - Utilize PENDA to differentiate.
3. Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning - Admin will conduct walkthroughs with NESTI to determine needs for professional development and followup with classroom walkthroughs to monitor implementation.
4. Standards Aligned Instruction - PDs given on CUPs to ensure standards aligned instruction.
5. Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices (Rigor, Expectations, Engagement) - WICOR strategies used in instruction as well as cornerstone tasks embedded in the CUPs.

**Person Responsible** Kara Crisp (kara.crisp@osceolaschools.net)

**#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	ESSA data showed in 2018-2019 one sub group was below the ESSA level 41%. This affected the proficiency and student achievement seen throughout the state reporting of school data. The school is TS&I status.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	ESSA Data for 2018-2019 ESE- 40% will increase in 2020-2021 to be above 41 %.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	NWEA Data
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Kara Crisp (kara.crisp@osceolaschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately 7 challenging learning experiences for all their students. Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four specific elements related to curriculum: Content- the information and skills that students need to learn Process -how students make sense of the content being taught Product - how students demonstrate what they have learned Affect - the feelings and attitudes that affect students' learning
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Progress Monitoring and Disaggregating of Data - Monitor Disaggregated NWEA Data to track growth of ESSA subgroups
2. Instructional Practices (Rigor, Engagement, Expectations, and Differentiated Classroom) - WICOR strategies used in instruction as well as cornerstone tasks embedded in the CUPs.
3. Professional Learning Communities - Admin and Coaches will support PLCs. Admin and Coaches will conduct coaching cycles to determine needs for professional development and followup with classroom walkthroughs to monitor implementation.
4. Equity and Diversity for all ESSA Subgroups
5. MTSS Instructional Intervention Practices - WIN intervention for all subgroups to ensure growth

**Person Responsible** Kara Crisp (kara.crisp@osceolaschools.net)

**#6. Other specifically relating to Culture and Environment**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Well-implemented programs designed to foster SEL are associated with positive outcomes, ranging from better test scores and higher graduation rates to improved social behavior. Social-emotional competencies include skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions; mindsets, such as thinking positively about how to handle challenges; and habits, such as coming to class prepared. A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for learning. It provides the foundation that students need, to develop the social, emotional, and academic competencies they need to succeed in life.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	2020-21 SEL Climate Survey showed 38% of students answered favorable for school belonging. In 2021-2022 the percent of students answering this question favorably will increase by 10%.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	SEL Climate Survey
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Frankie Franceschi (frankie.franceschi@osceolaschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess individual learning styles and be flexible in time management to allow for meeting these different needs.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Social and Emotional learning (SEL) is not based on prescribed curricula; instead it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student centered. They use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Social Emotional Learning - SEL Lessons through WIN, Character Strong
2. Community and Parent Involvement - Title 1 Parent Meetings and SAC Meetings, Community Partners
3. Positive Behavior Intervention Practices - School wide Implementation of PBIS Expectations
4. Equity and Diversity - Staff PD Warm Demand, School wide Demographic Data Shared
5. School wide Post Secondary Culture for all Students - Xello

**Person Responsible** Frankie Franceschi (frankie.franceschi@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.

**Our current concerns are the high ISS and OSS amounts for our African American and Hispanic students. Imbalance of male and female referrals. Fine tune PBIS initiative to promote positive behavior and to lower discipline numbers. Positive character trait per month. Award individual classes exhibiting the trait of the month. Monitor with discipline data monthly.**



## 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.

The school engage families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction, and hold staff responsible for implementing any changes. We frequently communicate high expectations for all students (e.g., "All students are college material").

Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example:

- Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in disaggregated data
- Student work is displayed throughout school
- All students are enrolled in college and career ready prep curriculum

A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created. Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for

themes/patterns among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, in and

out-of-school suspension, and attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for particular groups within a school and what needs to be done. Such as, establishing specific strategies, but attainable for reducing disproportionate discipline with staff, student, and family input. Implementing evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and

provide ongoing training and feedback to teachers on implementing these approaches. The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and, actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on school-wide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. They also structure the master schedule to include collaborative planning and ensure it is rooted in data on student progress and interests. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. The schools, curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students. The school has established an infrastructure to support family

engagement, such as a decision-making through SAC council. It reaches out to families and the community early and often - not just when there is an issue. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students, and follow up with what's being done as a result. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation, and provide food and childcare). It is a priority for the school to intentionally



engage with families of historically under-served students (e.g., by providing opportunities for small-group conversations with school leaders). Finally, the school provides all teachers with training on social and emotional skills.

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

- Thomas Rademacher - Principal
- Kara Crisp - Assistant Principal
- Frankie Franceschi - Assistant Principal
- Teresa Augustine - Dean
- Monica Forty-Way - Dean
- Adrianna Zuniga - Guidance
- Sylmari Mendez - Guidance
- Kacie Rosario - LRS
- Judith Genao - Interventionist
- Shaniqua Wilkerson - Social Worker

**Part V: Budget**

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

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		120-Classroom Teachers	0311 - Neptune Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$0.00
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science</b>				<b>\$3,500.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		690-Computer Software	0311 - Neptune Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$3,500.00
			<i>Notes: PENDA Learning</i>			
<b>5</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Other: Culture and Environment</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$3,500.00</b>