**School District of Osceola County, FL**

# St. Cloud Middle School



# 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# St. Cloud Middle School

1975 S MICHIGAN AVE, St Cloud, FL 34769

www.osceolaschools.net

## Demographics

## Principal: Christina Harrell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2021

| | |
|---|---|
| **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) | 65% |
| **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 (61%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (62%) |
| **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

# St. Cloud Middle School

## 1975 S MICHIGAN AVE, St Cloud, FL 34769

## www.osceolaschools.net

### School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | **2020-21 Title I School** | **2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| Middle School<br>6-8 | Yes | 79% |

| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate**<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| K-12 General Education | No | 64% |

### 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.**

Student Achievement is our #1 Priority.

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

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

## School Leadership Team

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

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Harrell, Christina | Principal | in charge of financial, curricular, and instructional resources and decisions |
| Burda, Nicole | Assistant Principal | In charge of curricular and instructional decisions |
| Krebs, Nichole | Instructional Coach | provides curricular intervention and provides progress monitoring data for district and state assessment |
| Rousch, Amy | Assistant Principal | in charge of curricular and instructional decisions |
| Howard, Lonnie | Dean | provides 6th-8th grade level discipline, EWS data, and state testing coordinator |
| Leonard, Sherry | Other | provides curricular intervention and provides progress monitoring data for district and state assessment |
| Fontaine, Kevin | Math Coach | provides curricular intervention and provides progress monitoring data for district and state assessment |
| Hoffman, Nicole | School Counselor | 8th Grade Guidance Counselor, 504 & FIT Coordinator - provides focused support of students |
| Roop, Anastasia | School Counselor | 6th Grade Guidance Counselor, 504 & FIT Coordinator - provides focused support of students |
| Metz, Dylan | School Counselor | 7th Grade Guidance Counselor, 504 & FIT Coordinator - provides focused support of students |
| Barley, Carrie | Other | overseeing implementation of student IEPs, 504s, and compliance |
| Alvarez, Lourdes | ELL Compliance Specialist | assists in the coordination of eligibility and placement of ELLs, ensures an efficient system of staffing for all ELL students, supports teachers with instructional strategies for students |
| Whigham, Lisa | School Counselor | ESE Guidance Counselor, 504 & FIT Coordinator - provides focused support of students |
| Hosein, Ismail | Dean | provides 6th-8th grade level discipline, and EWS data |

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/14/2021, Christina Harrell

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

7

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

35

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

85

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

1,212

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

6

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

15

**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 | 351 | 420 | 439 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1210 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 69 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 222 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 25 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 102 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 318 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 188 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 431 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 52 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 |

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

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 8/26/2021

## 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 | 425 | 426 | 418 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1269 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 43 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 31 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 66 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 203 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 67 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 215 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 47 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |

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

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

**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 | 425 | 426 | 418 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1269 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 43 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 31 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 66 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 203 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 67 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 215 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 47 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |

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

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

## 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 | | | | 55% | 45% | 54% | 58% | 47% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 52% | 48% | 54% | 59% | 51% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 41% | 42% | 47% | 44% | 42% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 63% | 49% | 58% | 62% | 49% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 57% | 51% | 57% | 62% | 55% | 57% |

| School Grade Component | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 55% | 47% | 51% | 54% | 52% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 62% | 47% | 51% | 55% | 48% | 52% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 80% | 72% | 72% | 80% | 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 | 54% | 48% | 6% | 54% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 47% | 2% | 52% | -3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -54% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 57% | 49% | 8% | 56% | 1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -49% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 45% | 9% | 55% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 22% | 30% | -8% | 54% | -32% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -54% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 47% | 16% | 46% | 17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -22% | | | | |

| 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 | 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 | 96% | 44% | 52% | 57% | 39% |

## Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

NWEA testing in Fall, Winter, and Spring; ORF, Osceola Writes, and Unit assessments, common formative assessments; School City

| Grade 6 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 57% | 50 | 49 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 49 | 47 | 47 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 23 | 15 | 15 |
| | English Language Learners | 27 | 25 | 29 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 48 | 53 | 48 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 39 | 44 | 39 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 19 | 22 | 22 |
| | English Language Learners | 19 | 27 | 27 |

| Grade 7 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 65 | 52 | 54 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 58 | 44 | 46 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 32 | 26 | 19 |
| | English Language Learners | 32 | 16 | 21 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 46 | 47 | 47 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 37 | 39 | 40 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 22 | 13 | 16 |
| | English Language Learners | 24 | 20 | 20 |
| **Civics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 53 | 54 | 61 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 38 | 45 | 51 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17 | 19 | 27 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 18 | 23 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 40 | 37 | 49 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 34 | 28 | 39 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 21 | 14 | 14 |
| | English Language Learners | 7 | 11 | 10 |
| **Science** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 67 | 60 | 70 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 66 | 55 | 67 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 47 | 30 | 47 |
| | English Language Learners | 15 | 30 | 33 |

## 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 | 43 | 34 | 29 | 43 | 38 | 41 | 51 | | | |
| ELL | 25 | 43 | 46 | 28 | 40 | 47 | 34 | 52 | | | |
| ASN | 63 | 75 | | 74 | 69 | | 80 | | | | |
| BLK | 40 | 44 | 32 | 40 | 33 | 35 | 45 | 59 | 73 | | |
| HSP | 44 | 48 | 37 | 44 | 44 | 38 | 55 | 73 | 66 | | |
| MUL | 49 | 39 | | 53 | 44 | | 47 | 56 | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 52 | 40 | 63 | 51 | 57 | 74 | 84 | 87 | | |
| FRL | 43 | 45 | 35 | 43 | 40 | 38 | 55 | 71 | 66 | | |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Subgroups** | **ELA Ach.** | **ELA LG** | **ELA LG L25%** | **Math Ach.** | **Math LG** | **Math LG L25%** | **Sci Ach.** | **SS Ach.** | **MS Accel.** | **Grad Rate 2017-18** | **C & C Accel 2017-18** |
| SWD | 21 | 39 | 34 | 33 | 49 | 40 | 22 | 43 | 75 | | |
| ELL | 36 | 45 | 40 | 43 | 56 | 47 | 28 | 61 | 59 | | |

| 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 | 72 | 56 | | 72 | 72 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 52 | 49 | 57 | 57 | 53 | 37 | 43 | 83 | 88 | | |
| HSP | 48 | 50 | 42 | 56 | 56 | 54 | 53 | 77 | 88 | | |
| MUL | 51 | 45 | 20 | 59 | 46 | 55 | 76 | 83 | 80 | | |
| WHT | 61 | 54 | 41 | 70 | 58 | 58 | 69 | 82 | 89 | | |
| FRL | 46 | 49 | 42 | 56 | 53 | 49 | 48 | 74 | 80 | | |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 15 | 37 | 33 | 23 | 44 | 42 | 11 | 38 | | | |
| ELL | 18 | 48 | 44 | 28 | 50 | 47 | 26 | 35 | | | |
| ASN | 70 | 60 | | 75 | 60 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | 55 | 45 | 55 | 58 | 46 | 59 | 83 | 83 | | |
| HSP | 54 | 56 | 42 | 55 | 58 | 53 | 47 | 75 | 70 | | |
| MUL | 57 | 52 | | 59 | 68 | | 73 | 73 | | | |
| WHT | 62 | 62 | 46 | 68 | 66 | 58 | 61 | 83 | 74 | | |
| FRL | 51 | 55 | 43 | 54 | 58 | 52 | 45 | 74 | 76 | | |

## 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 | 55 |
| 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 | 50 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 549 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |

| 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% | |

| English Language Learners | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 41 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 72 |
| 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 | 45 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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?**

Overall, ELA Lowest Quartile Achievement has a historical trend of being the lowest performance area. For the 2021 testing season, the data shows an achievement percentage of just 51% showing proficiency. Math proficiency dropped 10 points to 53% proficiency. Math appeared to be an issue District wide.

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

Lowest quartile students in ELA, Math scores need to be improved overall in achievement, lowest quartile, and learning gains. We saw a drop in acceleration, so that should be a focus, also.

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

We believe that digital learning last year had a profound impact on data last year. We also saw a great deal of turnover, especially in the ELA department.

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

Science scores went up one percent. Our school had the highest science scores in the District among all traditional middle schools.

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

The 8th Grade Science PLC; we added two new members to this group and it was very successful.

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

We plan to offer more opportunities for students who may traditionally not have the opportunity to be accelerated. Ideally we would like to have every student leave us with at least one high school credit.

**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.**

We will have grade level PLCs this year so teachers can work together to better identify students who could qualify for acceleration.

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

We are now a Title I school, so we can use funds to provide professional development for faculty and staff; we can also provide extended learning opportunities for students using those funds and CARES Act money.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | By providing all students with grade-level, rigorous levels of literacy instruction we can ensure that students receive the support and guidance necessary to be successful on all end of year assessments. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Goals for 2022 FSA ELA (growth is based on 2019-2020 scores): Overall Achievement 60% (11% growth) Overall Learning Gains 55% (6% growth) Lowest Quartile 42% (6% growth) |
| **Monitoring:** | The desired outcomes will be progress monitored utilizing NWEA benchmark assessments, oral reading fluency, Osceola writes, and unit assessments. Professional learning communities will utilize common assessments to monitor student growth. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Nichole Krebs (nichole.krebs@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Utilize district curriculum unit plans and online resources such as Achieve3000, Beable, McGraw-Hill, NWEA, and DIBELS. Professional learning communities will work at team and department levels to monitor student progress. Progress monitoring assessments will monitor student growth and student abilities. The reading coach will meet regularly with the ELA department and provide weekly mentoring to new teachers. The MTSS team will meet weekly to monitor student growth. Professional learning opportunities will be provided to teachers as needed. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Utilizing district curriculum unit plans will ensure commonality across grade levels and vertical alignment that supports school and district desired outcomes. Professional learning communities will monitor student progress through common assessments by tracking data and providing differentiation to student through centers and PRIDE interventions as needed. NWEA is used to monitor student growth and determine projected proficiency on state assessments. The reading coach will meet regularly with the ELA department to ensure strategies and assessments are being implemented with fidelity across grade levels as well as provide weekly mentoring to new teachers to ensure teacher retention. The MTSS team will monitor student growth and provide additional support and interventions as needed during PRIDE. Professional learning opportunities will be provided to teachers on assessment, curriculum, and strategy implementation to ensure fidelity as needed. |

### Action Steps to Implement

Provide mentoring to new teachers in ELA department.

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

Provide training on NWEA, Achieve3000, Beable, B.E.S.T. standards, DIBELS, McGraw-Hill curriculum, utilization of curriculum unit plans, and school city to school personnel as needed.

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

Teachers deliver daily content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by ensuring standardized lessons and using differentiated instruction for ELL and ESE students.

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

Ensure professional learning communities are meeting to progress monitor and track student progress.

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

Ensure all students are being supported in Tier1, Tier 2, and Tier 3.

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

| **#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math** | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Math scores dropped ten points from 2019 to 2021. We would like to see an increase in overall achievement to return to the 50th percentile. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | We would like to see our schoolwide math scores increase to 55%, having at least 52% of our students make learning gains and 48% of our lowest quartile show growth. |
| **Monitoring:** | Walk-throughs by Administration, Math Coach, NWEA progress monitoring, PRIDE class (changes as needed per progress report/quarter). Utilize district approved resources (Kagan Strategies, Prodigy, formative assessments, NWEA, School City, CUPs) that have proven to increase student scores and abilities, monitoring growth and providing scaffolding and intervention during PRIDE when necessary to continue to support student achievement in math. We have also implemented Intensive Math as a course this year for students who are struggling. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kevin Fontaine (kevin.fontaine@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | When teachers are utilizing the provided material from the district that has been proven to be effective and viable curriculum, and monitoring the progress of students through standard mastery, we can ensure that all students are receiving rigorous instruction that pushes them to excel within their math courses.<br><br>*Common assessments<br>*NWEA<br>*Goal setting<br>*Talk Moves<br>*Prodigy |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | We are piloting a new program this year that is used internationally. Using common assessments and NWEA to progress monitor students, we can provide more effective instruction and interventions to close the achievement gap. |

| **Action Steps to Implement** | |
|---|---|
| Administer Fall, Winter, and Spring NWEA (progress monitoring) and adjust student schedules/ intervention period as needed | |
| **Person Responsible** | Kevin Fontaine (kevin.fontaine@osceolaschools.net) |
| Have data chats with students and have them set quarterly and yearly goals for math | |
| **Person Responsible** | Kevin Fontaine (kevin.fontaine@osceolaschools.net) |
| Enroll students in Intensive Math as needed | |
| **Person Responsible** | Amy Rousch (amy.rousch@osceolaschools.net) |

Ensure teachers deliver daily content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by using standardized lessons and differentiated instruction for ELL and ESE students.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Amy Rousch (amy.rousch@osceolaschools.net) |

## #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

| | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Our school's science scores were the highest among traditional middle schools this year. We hope to continue and grow that success for 2021-2022. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | We would like to increase our Science Achievement by 6 pts. this year. We would also like to see 100% pass rate among all accelerated students (7th and 8th). |
| **Monitoring:** | Administrative walk-throughs, using this PLC as a LEAD PLC on campus, progress monitoring through NWEA, schedule changes into Science PRIDE courses as needed |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Lonnie Howard (lonnie.kujawa@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | A PLC is "an ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve. Professional learning communities operate under the assumption that the key to improved learning for students is continuous job-embedded learning for educators." (Solution Tree) PLC's have long been implemented in Osceola County. Their impact on student achievement - when they are effective - is well noted. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | This was a strength in the Science Department during 2020-2021. That coupled with the ability to better progress monitor with NWEA (as it was shown to be very aligned to FSA scores) will lend to us achieving this goal. |

## Action Steps to Implement

Ensure teachers deliver daily content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by using standardized lessons and differentiated instruction for ELL and ESE students.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Ismail Hosein (ismail.hosein@osceolaschools.net) |

Ensure professional learning communities are meeting to progress monitor and track student progress.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Ismail Hosein (ismail.hosein@osceolaschools.net) |

Administer Fall, Winter, and Spring NWEA (progress monitoring), and adjust intervention period as needed

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Amy Rousch (amy.rousch@osceolaschools.net) |

| #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Our Civics EOC scores dropped three points from 2019. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | We would like our pass rate to go up by eight points this year on the Civics EOC to 85%. |
| **Monitoring:** | Administrative Walk-Throughs, monitoring the Civics PLC, progress monitoring, PRIDE Group designations as need be |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Nicole Burda (nicole.burda@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | A PLC is "an ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve. Professional learning communities operate under the assumption that the key to improved learning for students is continuous job-embedded learning for educators." (Solution Tree) PLC's have long been implemented in Osceola County. Their impact on student achievement - when they are effective - is well noted. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | PLC is a strength for our Civics Department. We believe now that digital learning is no longer a factor, this PLC will have a more profound impact on student achievement. |

### Action Steps to Implement

Ensure teachers deliver daily content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by using standardized lessons and differentiated instruction for ELL and ESE students.

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

Ensure professional learning communities are meeting to progress monitor and track student progress.

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

Ensure all students are being supported in Social Studies in Tier1, Tier 2, and Tier 3.

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

Administer Fall, Winter, and Spring NWEA (progress monitoring), and adjust intervention period as needed

| **Person Responsible** | Amy Rousch (amy.rousch@osceolaschools.net) |
|---|---|

| #5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities | |
| --- | --- |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Students in the lowest quartile, in particular students with disabilities, have not made sufficient learning gains nor have they demonstrated adequate proficiency on FSA/EOCs. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | To increase achievement and learning gains among this population of students on statewide testing. |
| **Monitoring:** | Teachers will embed accommodations and needed interventions for ESE Students into their lesson plans. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Nicole Burda (nicole.burda@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Track data of ESE Students who refuse help or accommodations through Focus. Encourage the use of accommodations. SWD will receive grade-level instruction that is scaffolded to meet their academic needs. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Ensuring accommodations are in place and followed with fidelity should increase student achievement among our lowest quartile, especially SWD. |

### Action Steps to Implement

Administer Fall, Winter, and Spring NWEA (progress monitoring), and adjust intervention period as needed.

| **Person Responsible** | Amy Rousch (amy.rousch@osceolaschools.net) |
| --- | --- |

Ensure students Tier 2 and Tier 3 students are progress monitored at a higher frequency

| **Person Responsible** | Sherry Leonard (sherry.leanard@osceolaschools.net) |
| --- | --- |

Ensure teachers deliver daily content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by using standardized lessons and differentiated instruction for ELL and ESE students.

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

Admit students into MTSS as needed

| **Person Responsible** | Sherry Leonard (sherry.leanard@osceolaschools.net) |
| --- | --- |

| #6. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | It is important for current leaders to mentor and provide opportunities for potential future leaders. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | We hope to identify and mentor at least ten potential educational leaders. Among those are our four deans. As they move into administrative roles, we will target individuals to assume theirs. |
| **Monitoring:** | Leadership meetings; providing opportunities for growth based on each individual's need; monitoring NCIPE growth plans |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Nicole Burda (nicole.burda@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | "Teacher leadership, as a means to improving schools, 'is a powerful strategy to promote effective, collaborative teaching practices in schools that lead to increased student achievement, improved decision making at the school and district level, and create a dynamic teaching profession for the 21st century.'" (Learning Forward: Professional Learning Association) |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | We believe that highly effective teaching translates into highly effective educational leadership, both of which promote student achievement. |

| Action Steps to Implement |
|---|

Provide potential leaders with opportunities for professional growth and mentor them throughout the year

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

Hold weekly leadership meetings to discuss areas of need/growth for current team members

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

Monitor growth plans and do quarterly check-ins with potential school leaders

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

| #7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Digital learning impacted our student's academically and socially/emotionally. Having a solid PBIS program for those returning to face to face learning will improve those outcomes. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Ideally there will be more student participation in PBIS activities while simultaneously seeing a drop in schoolwide discipline events. |
| **Monitoring:** | Utilize old PBIS activities on a quarterly basis, recognize students who demonstrate schoolwide expectations, utilize progressive discipline through the Dean's Office; hold PBIS meetings monthly to evaluate discipline data |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kyle Clark (kyle.clark@osceolaschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | PBIS is a multi-tiered, evidence-based model that seeks to support and enhance both academic and behavioral outcomes for all students. "The broad purpose of PBIS is to improve the effectiveness, efficiency and equity of schools and other agencies. PBIS improves social, emotional and academic outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities and students from underrepresented groups" (pbis.org) |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | This is a Districtwide Initiative that we have been implementing at our school for years. |

## Action Steps to Implement

We will hold monthly schoolwide PBIS events for students to which they may access using our token economy (Mustang Money)

| **Person Responsible** | Ismail Hosein (ismail.hosein@osceolaschools.net) |
|---|---|

We will employ a system of progressive discipline for students to allow opportunities for them to relearn expectations

| **Person Responsible** | Ismail Hosein (ismail.hosein@osceolaschools.net) |
|---|---|

Staff will be provided training on PBIS and invited to participate on our PBIS committee.

| **Person Responsible** | Ismail Hosein (ismail.hosein@osceolaschools.net) |
|---|---|

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](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 school is ranked 104 out of 553 middle schools in the state of Florida as it pertains to discipline data. As such, we will continue to enforce our schoolwide rules, expectations, and employ PBIS on campus. One area of concern is that we are ranked last in our District for violent incidents (i.e. fights, physical attacks, etc.). Another area of concern is that we are ranked 6th in our District for Drug incidents. While these are considered to be low and very low respectively, we will continue to monitor students in conjunction with our SRO to curtail acts of violence and drug use on campus. We encourage our students to speak out if they see something to foster a sense of community and safety.**

## 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.**

Research suggests that a strong sense of community is important to maintaining a positive educational environment, optimizing engagement, and keeping anxiety levels low, all learning factors that have been shown to
enhance student achievement. We are a PBIS school, and we strive to implement and model those strategies every day at SCMS.

Monthly PRIDE lessons will be taught by teachers focusing on key character traits like respect and integrity. Counselors will continue to be available for students in crisis, and there will be MTSS social/emotional groups for our T2 and T3 discipline/disruption students. Teaching inclusion and multicultural awareness will also be stressed throughout the school year.

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

All faculty and staff members at SCMS are stakeholders in promoting a positive culture and environment. This is done through building relationships with students, providing "red carpet" customer service to parents and community members. As a Title I school, we will hold multiple events throughout the year to encourage participation among our school community to build upon and foster positive relationships together.

## Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | $0.00 |
|---|--------|---------------------------------------------|-------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | $0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | $0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies | $0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | $0.00 |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development | $0.00 |
| 7 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | $0.00 |
| | | **Total:** | **$0.00** |