

Marion County Public Schools

Osceola Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Osceola Middle School

526 SE TUSCAWILLA AVE, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Matthew Koff

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2021

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	71%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Marion County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Osceola Middle School

526 SE TUSCAWILLA AVE, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	44%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Koff, Matthew	Principal	The Principal designs and implements a professional development plan which focuses on maximizing use of strategies to foster standards based instruction. The Principal ensures that members of the school based leadership team are all actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process. The principal actively discusses student data from Tier 1 progress monitoring tools with teachers in order to track effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction.
Panitzke, Robert	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal of Discipline (APD) is responsible for overseeing the Student Service Department and facilities. The APD works alongside the principal to teach and support the teachers as they work through implementing the best strategies possible in the classrooms. The APD is a consistent presence in the classroom by offering support and nonjudgmental feedback. The members of the school based leadership team are all actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process. The assistant principals meet frequently with the school psychologist, social worker, school counselor, specific teachers at problem solving meetings to re-visit data from students struggling at each Tier of instruction. Resources and interventions are assigned and monitored at the PST meetings. Appropriate direct instruction and computer software are utilized for both remediation and enrichment. Parents are notified of progress through progress reports, email, and parent conferences.
Shawley, Aimee	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of Professional Development of literacy strategies in all classrooms. She also assists in data analysis including QSMA and progress monitoring data. The Instructional Coach also works as an active member of the multidisciplinary team.
Collins, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal of Curriculum (APC) is responsible for curriculum related matters and overseeing the guidance department. The APC works alongside the principal to teach and support the teachers as they work through implementing the best strategies possible in the classrooms. The APC is a consistent presence in the classroom by offering support and nonjudgmental feedback. The members of the school based leadership team are all actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process. The assistant principals meet frequently with the school psychologist, social worker, school counselor, specific teachers at problem solving meetings to re-visit data from students struggling at each Tier of instruction. Resources and interventions are assigned and monitored at the PST meetings. Appropriate direct instruction and computer software are utilized for both remediation and enrichment. Parents are notified of progress through progress reports, email, and parent conferences.
Lorick, Amanda	School Counselor	School Counselors develop and carry out programs based on developmental needs of students, needs assessments, and school, district, and state priorities. Counselors communicated goals and services of the counseling programs to school administration, staff, students, and parents. School

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Counselors provide personal/growth counseling including individual and/or group to promote academic success. School counselors are members of the school based leadership team and are actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process.
Schooley, Morgen	School Counselor	School Counselors develop and carry out programs based on developmental needs of students, needs assessments, and school, district, and state priorities. Counselors communicated goals and services of the counseling programs to school administration, staff, students, and parents. School Counselors provide personal/growth counseling including individual and/or group to promote academic success. School counselors are members of the school based leadership team and are actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/2/2021, Matthew Koff

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

0

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

Total number of students enrolled at the school

968

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

8

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

11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	316	338	306	0	0	0	0	960
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	116	80	0	0	0	0	275
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	66	59	0	0	0	0	183
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	57	72	0	0	0	0	183
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	84	73	0	0	0	0	224
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	52	43	0	0	0	0	155
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	65	49	0	0	0	0	170
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	91	109	94	2	0	0	0	296

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	2	4	14	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/30/2021

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	333	346	328	0	0	0	0	1007
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	26	29	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	22	19	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	1	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	18	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	41	53	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	69	58	0	0	0	0	178

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	19	23	0	0	0	0	48

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	333	346	328	0	0	0	0	1007	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	26	29	0	0	0	0	80	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	22	19	0	0	0	0	48	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	1	0	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	18	0	0	0	0	31	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	41	53	0	0	0	0	148	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	69	58	0	0	0	0	178	

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	19	23	0	0	0	0	48

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				61%	49%	54%	62%	47%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	54%	54%	55%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	46%	47%	43%	45%	47%
Math Achievement				69%	54%	58%	65%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains				68%	58%	57%	64%	61%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	50%	51%	47%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				65%	46%	51%	65%	46%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				74%	70%	72%	77%	66%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	60%	45%	15%	54%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	58%	46%	12%	52%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
08	2021					
	2019	63%	50%	13%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	62%	46%	16%	55%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	61%	49%	12%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
08	2021					
	2019	60%	41%	19%	46%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	64%	44%	20%	48%	16%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	72%	65%	7%	71%	1%
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	100%	54%	46%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	98%	51%	47%	57%	41%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Middle:

The progress monitoring tools used by grade level to compile the data below are:

- English Language Arts, Grades 6-8: ELA Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
- Mathematics Grades 6-8: Math Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
- Algebra: Algebra Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
- Geometry: Geometry Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
- Civics: Civics Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
- Science: Grade 8 Science Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	125 / 46%	104 / 35%	112 / 41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28 / 23%	20 / 15%	25 / 20%
	Students With Disabilities	7 / 23%	4 / 11%	1 / 3%
	English Language Learners	1 / 8%	1 / 7%	1 / 8%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	"Math 164 / 62% "	"Math 139 / 47% "	"Math 118 / 44% "
	Economically Disadvantaged	"Math 46 / 41% "	"Math 36 / 27% "	"Math 28 / 23% "
	Students With Disabilities	"Math 9 / 30% "	"Math 4 / 11% "	"Math 2 / 6% "
	English Language Learners	"Math 5 / 42% "	"Math 2 / 14% "	"Math 2 / 15% "
Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	206 / 69%	178 / 56%	147 / 51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	61 / 54%	49 / 38%	39 / 32%
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 20%	3 / 13%	2 / 9%
	English Language Learners	6 / 50%	4 / 33%	4 / 36%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	"Math 154 / 66% Algebra 39 / 65% "	"Math 152 / 61% Algebra 40 / 67% "	"Math 131 / 55% Algebra 42 / 88% "
	Economically Disadvantaged	"Math 63 / 56% Algebra 3 / 100% "	"Math 60 / 49% Algebra 3 / 100% "	"Math 53 / 44% Algebra 2 / 100% "
	Students With Disabilities	"Math 5 / 24% "	"Math 6 / 26% "	"Math 3 / 14% "
	English Language Learners	"Math 6 / 50% "	"Math 5 / 42% "	"Math 5 / 42% "
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	214 / 72%	225 / 76%	215 / 72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	57 / 50%	66 / 53%	67 / 57%
	Students With Disabilities	6 / 29%	7 / 30%	6 / 27%
	English Language Learners	4 / 33%	4 / 33%	3 / 27%

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	94 / 38%	109 / 41%	109 / 43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23 / 24%	30 / 29%	25 / 25%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 7%	2 / 10%	1 / 5%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	"Math 67 / 52% Algebra 29 / 50% Geo 32 / 56%"	"Math 99 / 67% Algebra 37 / 63% Geo 38 / 67%"	"Math 80 / 58% Algebra 38 / 64% Geo 32 / 59%"
	Economically Disadvantaged	"Math 37 / 48% Algebra 6 / 60% Geo 7 / 88%"	"Math 53 / 60% Algebra 7 / 70% Geo 7 / 88%"	"Math 40 / 49% Algebra 8 / 80% Geo 6 / 86%"
	Students With Disabilities	"Math 5 / 33% "	"Math 8 / 40% "	"Math 7 / 39% "
	English Language Learners	"Math 2 / 40% "	"Math 4 / 67% "	"Math 1 / 25% "
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	140 / 53%	174 / 61%	188 / 69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38 / 37%	46 / 41%	52 / 48%
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 24%	4 / 18%	4 / 18%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 14%

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	16	32	32	23	39	35	16	38			
ELL	14	47	48	25	50	46	8	26			
ASN	79	72		75	52			91	86		
BLK	28	38	30	23	27	22	13	36			
HSP	40	50	46	41	46	39	40	56	46		
MUL	55	53		55	49		64	79			
WHT	69	59	40	73	56	47	68	86	82		
FRL	37	46	39	38	44	34	32	53	42		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	23	35	29	30	57	50	32	44			
ELL	37	53	46	57	64	57	30	50			
ASN	70	74		80	84						
BLK	25	37	39	33	50	47	37	62	43		
HSP	52	51	41	67	67	63	55	56	77		
MUL	46	53	50	64	83		45	71			
WHT	72	60	50	77	71	59	73	81	77		
FRL	45	49	44	55	63	57	53	65	57		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	25	45	41	35	47	34	24	44			
ELL	22	55	50	33	67	58		45			
ASN	78	47		83	78						
BLK	33	43	35	34	48	38	33	45	38		
HSP	50	53	54	57	64	50	59	82	46		
MUL	62	62	54	66	73	58		75			
WHT	71	58	44	73	67	53	73	83	65		
FRL	44	49	41	48	57	45	48	68	45		

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	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	559
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	76
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	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	59
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	64
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	42
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?

Across the board Osceola's scores on FSA were lower than the previous tested year (2019). Math represented our largest drop: 12% for 6th graders, 7% for 7th grade, and 16% for 8th grade. Learning gains in Math for the lowest quartile dropped 20%. During the year, 19% of the students had 1 or more days of suspension and 28% of the students had less than 90% attendance.

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

Student Proficiency in math (9%) and Science (8%) declined significantly from the previous tested year. Student proficiency in ELA had decline of 2%.

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

Decreased opportunities for engagement in content area text led to less mastery in deciphering word problems and the ability to calculate grade level mathematics. Increased focus on introducing and utilizing subject area vocabulary and comprehension strategies will increase student ability to read and understand grade level text. A focus on standards based task alignment and planning during collaborative opportunities will help to increase student achievement.

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

The two areas that showed improvement were Geometry and Middle School Acceleration. Both areas showed an increase of 2% from the previous tested year.

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

The introduction of additional resources in Geometry provided additional practice with standards based questions contributing to an increase in Geometry of 2%. More opportunities were provided for learners to participate in accelerated courses including Geometry, Algebra and Industry Certifications.

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

Common Planning will provide teachers with opportunities to share interdisciplinary literacy strategies and ensure tasks align with the rigor of the standards. Professional learning opportunities provided by the Instructional coach to assist teachers to incorporate disciplinary literacy strategies within the classroom.

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.

Osceola Middle School was able to add an Interventionalist position to work with teachers and develop professional learning opportunities. We were also able to hire a Math Intervention teacher that will work with students that struggle in Math. Monthly faculty meetings will include best practice presentation to the faculty from staff members. The second and fourth Wednesdays of each month will be department collaboration meetings to align instructional strategies and tasks within the lessons to the rigor of the content area standards. The Media Center will align weekly word of the week contest to reflect Tier 2 vocabulary terms from core subject areas to increase comprehension.

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

Osceola Middle adopted a new curriculum for Language arts that align with the BEST standards and a cross walk was developed to teach the current Florida State Standards. The Math intervention teacher will work with specific students that scored at a Level 1 or Level 2 during the 2021 FSA Math Assessment.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Osceola has been working on the Rigor, Relevance, and Relationship model heading into our fourth year. In this model we were focused on meaningful and thoughtful work. Through test scores and teacher observations we will continue our meaningful and thoughtful work adding in content literacy. Through data analysis it is evident that our students struggle with academic language in all classes and being able to decipher word problems in Math. The push for vocabulary embedded within the lesson will help increase that academic vocabulary and increase scores exponentially.
Measurable Outcome:	Research shows that students in the grade levels of 5-7 have the ability to learn 1-5000 new words a year. This increase in academic vocabulary will increase understanding of questions being asked in standardized tests. This new understanding should allow for an increase of at least 5% in our student growth and close the learning gap with our lowest quartile students.
Monitoring:	Bi-weekly subject area collaboration meetings aligning lessons and comparing embedded vocabulary lessons to ensure best practices. Interventionalist working directly with teachers to assist in implementing literacy based strategies within the content. QSMA data analysis, breaking down each question to identify gaps in language and vocabulary acquisition. Monthly Faculty Focus meeting with professional development focusing on best practices of content area literacy that work in the classroom.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matthew Koff (matthew.koff@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Early release days will be used for professional development. District Area Specialist will provide professional development on Critical Reading Strategies. School based professional development on Disciplinary Area Strategies. Faculty Focus meeting monthly will highlight best practices shared by staff members.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies align with the Area of Focus of literacy in the content areas. The professional development provided will help to increase literacy in all content areas as well as helping to align lessons and activities to the rigor of the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development during early release days on content and disciplinary literacy.
2. Administrative Walkthroughs
3. Content Area Specialist (CAS) support.

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus	Students with Disabilities is an area in which improvement is needed based upon the most recent ESSA data received. It is the only category in which Osceola Middle School did not reach the 41% target set by the Federal index.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	If inclusion and ESE teachers collaborate and plan effectively with general education teachers, then students identified with a federal index below 41% (students with disabilities) will increase from 38% to 41% as measured by ESSA Federal Index
Monitoring:	Administration will analyze Quarterly Mastery Assessment Data (QSMA), i-Ready, Math and Reading 180 data. during Thursday afternoon administrative meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robert Panitzke (robert.panitzke@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Inclusion teachers will support ESE students in the main stream classroom. These inclusion teachers will be subject specific allowing for more collaboration and plan time with the general education teachers. Paraprofessionals will be used to support the main stream classroom when Inclusion teachers are not available, Two paraprofessionals will support students in the self contained classrooms taught by two teachers. In addition, monthly collaborative meetings will take place between all teachers, inclusion teachers, and self contained teachers to analyze data and help determine best practices in meeting each students individual needs. ESE teachers will be using effective teaching practices in focusing on student engagement in disciplinary and content area literacy, relevancy, and rigorous academic work.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Osceola Middle School is in year 4 of a focus on the Daggett System of Effective Instruction. Collaboration time with monthly meetings with ESE teachers will allow teachers to discuss individual student needs and focus on effective strategies to increase learning gains and/or bring students to proficiency in all state assessed subjects. These strategies align with the Area of Focus of literacy in the content areas. The professional development provided will help to increase literacy in all content areas as well as helping to align lessons and activities to the rigor of the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development during early release days on content and disciplinary literacy.
2. Administrative Walkthroughs
3. Content Area Specialist (CAS) support.

Person Responsible Robert Panitzke (robert.panitzke@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Osceola has been working on the Rigor, Relevance, and Relationship model heading into our fourth year. In this model we were focused on meaningful and thoughtful work. Through test scores and teacher observations we will continue our meaningful and thoughtful work adding in content literacy. Through data analysis it is evident that our students struggle with academic language in all classes and being able to decipher word problems in Math. The push for vocabulary embedded within the lesson will help increase that academic vocabulary and increase scores exponentially.
Measurable Outcome:	Research shows that students in the grade levels of 5-7 have the ability to learn 1-5000 new words a year. This increase in academic vocabulary will increase understanding of questions being asked in standardized tests. This new understanding should allow for an increase of at least 3 percent in student proficiency and 5 percent in student learning gains in Math.
Monitoring:	Bi-weekly Math collaboration meetings aligning lessons and comparing embedded vocabulary lessons to ensure best practices. Interventionalist working directly with teachers to assist in implementing literacy based strategies within Math. QSMA data analysis, breaking down each question to identify gaps in language and vocabulary acquisition. Monthly Faculty Focus meeting with professional development focusing on best practices of content area and disciplinary literacy that work in the classroom.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Collins (stephanie.collins@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Early release days will be used for professional development. District Area Specialist will provide professional development on Critical Reading Strategies. School based professional development on Disciplinary Area Strategies. Faculty Focus meeting monthly will highlight best practices shared by staff members.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies align with the Area of Focus of literacy in Math. The professional development provided will help to increase literacy in Math as well as helping to align lessons and activities to the rigor of the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development during early release days on content and disciplinary literacy.
2. Administrative Walkthroughs
3. Content Area Specialist (CAS) support.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

According to SafeSchoolsforAlex.com, Osceola has a high suspension rate in comparison to the state. We have implemented a Positive Behavior Interventions and Support team to help create an environment that supports positive behavior in the classroom. Cultural and community events have been planned to help close the communication gap with all stakeholders. It was also evident in discipline data of the disparity of referrals per 100 in our sub-groups particularly in our black and ESE population. Round table discussions with members of these subgroups are planned to gain insight on best practices and what works with them for positive supports for behavior in the classroom.

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.

Osceola Middle School is not a Title 1 school.

Instructional Staff go through training on how to provide positive relationships with all students. Student clubs promote positive messages around the school and through community service.

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

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

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

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

The teachers and staff at Osceola Middle will participate in our schoolwide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program. Using this program staff will recognize students and staff members for positive behaviors.

The students will promote positive behaviors by following the A (act responsibility), I (initiate respect), and M (model positive behavior) schoolwide expectations.

Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) and School Advisory Council (SAC) will provide parents and teachers the opportunities to work together to enhance student educational experiences by creating an inclusive environment for parent and community environment.

The Home School Liaison will help to promote new skills in parenting, and literacy to adults. They will also assist in the development of better relationships for parent/child and provide information on community resources.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00