

Okeechobee County School District

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	13
Planning for Improvement	21
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

Osceola Middle School

825 SW 28TH ST, Okeechobee, FL 34974

<http://osceolamiddleschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/>

Demographics

Principal: Alyson Sh IR Ley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2010

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)	100%
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 (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 was approved by the Okeechobee County School Board on 10/5/2021.

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	13
Planning for Improvement	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Osceola Middle School

825 SW 28TH ST, Okeechobee, FL 34974

<http://osceolamiddleschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okeechobee County School Board on 10/5/2021.

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.

OMS, partnering with families and the community, will empower all students to reach their maximum potential and be successful in their future endeavors.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Prepare today for YOUR tomorrow.

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
Downing, Sean	Principal	<p>I am responsible for leading all aspects of the educational and business functions at Osceola Middle School, a comprehensive Title 1 public school. We have approximately 700 students and 75 employees. In addition to responsibilities at the school site, I have served the last several years on middle school curriculum map design and on our instructional evaluation committee at the district level. I also spent time training administrators on our evaluation system. I annually attend several recruiting fairs both in and out of state. I also serve as one of the administrators on our targeted selection process. My school has been recognized with a school grade of B in three of the last four years. Our math scores were recognized for the ninth largest improvements in growth among all middle schools in the state (2016). I was the recipient of the Governor's Shine Award (2017). I was selected to participate in the Dr. Brian Dassler Commissioner's Leadership Academy (2015), Dr. Brian Dassler Commissioner's Leadership Academy-Facilitator in Training (2016), Florida Association of School Administrators Instructional Leadership Team Initiative Pilot (2017) and the Instructional Partners Middle School Coaching Pilot (2018). I was selected as the Okeechobee County District Principal of the Year (2020).</p>
Potter, Greg	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal assists the Principal with the overall management of the school's operational and educational programs.</p> <p>The Assistant Principal serves on the school's Leadership Team, assisting with instructional leadership and providing oversight and management supporting the fidelity of the school's MTSS program.</p> <p>In addition, the Assistant Principal partners with the Principal to supervise and evaluate teachers, and provides resources and supports to instructional staff in terms of supplies/equipment, time, opportunity, and structure for collaborative planning and evaluation of the instructional program.</p> <p>The Assistant Principal also oversees the school's Safety/Emergency Response Program, the Title I Program, and serves as the school's Title IX officer.</p> <p>Last, the Assistant Principal maintains inventories and ensures the smooth operation and maintenance of school facilities to support the school's mission and vision.</p>
Jarriel, Kelsey	Instructional Coach	<p>The instructional coach provides mentoring and coaching support to the instructional staff, as needed. More intensive supports are provided to new staff. This coach serves the ELA Program primarily; however, also assists with</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>any member of the instructional staff in need of support. The coach maintains data, coordinates common and diagnostic assessments, participates in collaborative planning with grade-level content teams and provides resources and guidance to the same. The coach also assists with academic MTSS support for planning interventions needed to assist struggling learners. In addition, the coach joins the Leadership Team in providing direct intervention support to students most in need of assistance (i.e. Tier 3).</p>
Maggard, Sara	School Counselor	<p>The Guidance Counselor provides direct assistance and intervention services to students in need. The counselor conducts threat assessments, works with families and district support staff to create and manage safety plans, mentors and counsels individual students, and works with the Assistant Principal and teachers to conduct Universal Mental Health screening. The counselor manages student ELL plans and maintains records of student progress to ensure smooth operation of the Course Recovery Program. The counselor also serves on the MTSS Leadership and Problem Solving Teams to assist with a variety RTI initiatives in support of OMS's students.</p>
Jarriel, Glenda	Dean	<p>The Dean manages the school's Behavior Program and serves on the Leadership Team to provide input and assistance in the development of responsive plans to support the maintenance of student connections to the Academic Program. The goal is to have each student pass their core classes and successfully advance to the next level. The Dean maintains data on student discipline referrals, school responses, and student (leveled) behavior plans. The Dean assists the Guidance Department in conducting threat assessments; specifically threats made toward others. The Dean is also a critical participant in the development and management of student safety plans, as well as the school emergency preparation and response.</p>
Talavera, Jessica	Staffing Specialist	<p>The Staffing Specialist manages the ESE Program and advises and assists with MTSS at OMS. As a member of the school's MTSS Leadership and School Problem-Solving Teams, the Staffing Specialist schedules and facilitates planning meetings, supports the development of Behavior Intervention Plans, collects and maintains important data. This person is essential in terms of ensuring good communication with parents and proper documentation of the ESE and MTSS efforts of the school.</p>
Nielson, Taylor	School Counselor	<p>The Guidance Counselor provides direct assistance and intervention services to students in need. The counselor conducts threat assessments, works with families and district support staff to create and manage safety plans, mentors and counsels individual students, and works with the Assistant Principal and teachers to conduct Universal Mental Health screening. The counselor manages the school's Attendance and Check and Connect Mentoring Program. The counselor also serves on the MTSS Leadership and Problem Solving Teams to assist with a variety RTI initiatives in support of OMS's students.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hurst, Nicole	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach provides mentoring and coaching support to the instructional staff, as needed. More intensive supports are provided to new staff. This coach serves the Math Program primarily; however, also assists with any member of the instructional staff in need of support. The coach maintains data, coordinates common and diagnostic assessments, participates in collaborative planning with grade-level content teams and provides resources and guidance to the same. The coach also assists with academic MTSS support for planning interventions needed to assist struggling learners. In addition, the coach joins the Leadership Team in providing direct intervention support to students most in need of assistance (i.e. Tier 3).

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2010, Alyson Sh IR Ley

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

695

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.

6

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	238	229	219	0	0	0	0	686
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	57	62	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	30	35	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	19	38	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	39	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	33	36	0	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	44	38	0	0	0	0	110
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	30	18	0	0	0	0	56
Identified Tier 3 MTSS Read Fall 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	30	19	0	0	0	0	57
Identified Tier 3 MTSS Math Fall 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	31	26	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	68	56	0	0	0	0	163
Level 1 on 2021 FSA Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	66	49	0	0	0	0	190

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	19	38	54	0	0	0	0	111

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	6	0	0	0	0	16

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/29/2021

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	231	281	216	0	0	0	0	728
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	26	29	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	52	42	0	0	0	0	120
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	28	4	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	37	10	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	69	78	0	0	0	0	214
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	47	35	0	0	0	0	133

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	31	50	36	0	0	0	0	117

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	231	281	216	0	0	0	0	728
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	26	29	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	52	42	0	0	0	0	120
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	28	4	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	37	10	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	69	78	0	0	0	0	214
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	47	35	0	0	0	0	133

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	31	50	36	0	0	0	0	117

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				44%	42%	54%	41%	40%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	48%	54%	47%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	43%	47%	39%	44%	47%
Math Achievement				63%	61%	58%	62%	58%	58%
Math Learning Gains				59%	60%	57%	69%	67%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	56%	51%	59%	54%	51%
Science Achievement				51%	43%	51%	40%	39%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				69%	60%	72%	65%	55%	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	46%	47%	-1%	54%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	43%	38%	5%	52%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
08	2021					
	2019	39%	37%	2%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	55%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	57%	55%	2%	54%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
08	2021					
	2019	58%	51%	7%	46%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	48%	41%	7%	48%	0%
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	69%	59%	10%	71%	-2%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	90%	52%	38%	61%	29%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	47%	53%	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 (ELA, Math, Science); District-created test (Civics PM 1-2), Civics EOC Results ("Spring" column)

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47%	38%	31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47%	38%	31%
	Students With Disabilities	18%	11%	10%
	English Language Learners	17%	17%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36%	43%	44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36%	43%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	12%	23%	16%
	English Language Learners	0%	17%	0%

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47%	45%	46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47%	45%	46%
	Students With Disabilities	28%	21%	29%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	20%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60%	63%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60%	63%	52%
	Students With Disabilities	35%	42%	26%
	English Language Learners	0%	25%	0%
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16%	52%	74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%	52%	74%
	Students With Disabilities	3%	24%	50%
	English Language Learners	0%	25%	0%

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60%	51%	55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60%	51%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	19%	23%
	English Language Learners	20%	22%	18%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56%	68%	53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56%	68%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	31%	45%	22%
	English Language Learners	11%	33%	9%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41%	49%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	41%	49%	45%
	Students With Disabilities	19%	19%	17%
	English Language Learners	10%	11%	11%

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	13	24	25	26	40	42	19	50			
ELL	18	23	23	42	35	29	24	71	27		
BLK	27	27	17	39	49	53	38				
HSP	29	31	24	55	47	44	44	75	51		
MUL	53	38		67	43						
WHT	44	46	38	56	47	47	46	73	48		
FRL	31	35	25	49	45	37	39	74	43		
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	14	37	36	33	48	46	17	33			
ELL	30	44	58	54	55	44	32	48	27		
BLK	27	40	33	46	47	56	33	57			

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
HSP	42	45	43	61	56	46	53	68	60		
MUL	41	41		56	50						
WHT	47	54	49	68	62	58	50	73	71		
FRL	37	48	44	58	56	52	40	61	62		
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	14	28	28	33	52	49	13	40			
ELL	23	40	41	50	62	62	12	68			
BLK	24	41	42	50	69	62	14	43			
HSP	39	48	37	62	67	57	36	67	67		
MUL	25	47		56	44						
WHT	45	48	40	65	72	60	48	64	61		
FRL	36	46	41	60	67	58	38	62	59		

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	47
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	473
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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

English Language Learners	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
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	50
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	49
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	43
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?

Except for Civics, every content area and school grade category lost ground between 2019 and 2021. SWD continue to have achievement gaps with their non-disabled peers. We fell short of school goals focused on learning gains in ELA, Math and with the Bottom Quartile.

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

Consistent gains (learning gains) from one test administration to the next. Performance of students in the bottom quartile/SWD.

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 think gaps have persisted and in some cases been made worse due to the pandemic (school shutdown and continued exclusions) which have caused ongoing learning loss. This learning loss is disproportionately impacting lower-income schools and communities.

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

Civics!

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

The Civics teachers continue to collaboratively plan and offer tutoring at a variety of times before, during and afterschool.

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

District restricts opportunities for us to offer courses to allow for acceleration (with regards to School Grading). In order to accelerate more students we need to continue to be efficient with who we select to place in Algebra and support them accordingly.

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.

No additional professional development opportunities are necessary

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

Overall we have implemented PD aimed at teacher efficacy which we hope will allow for sustainability of our work with the PLC process and response to intervention.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students who had gaps in their learning prior to the pandemic have been disproportionately negatively impacted by shut-downs and exclusions. Traditional instructional practices tend to move from topic to topic and standard to standard when the majority of the students demonstrate proficiency. Unfortunately, the students who do not demonstrate proficiency on a key standard may be repeated again and again, thus they fall farther and farther behind.

Additionally, individual teachers in classrooms across and among grade levels are not systematic about which standards they determine to be essential and the teacher in the classroom is not able to consistently define or measure what they determine proficiency looks like.

Measurable Outcome: Core content teachers will work collaboratively with their grade-alike peers to implement a PLC process. This will include identifying essential standards, developing common formative assessments (to be used after the delivery of core instruction and one to be used after some form of intervention), and utilizing Walk to Intervention.

Monitoring: This will be monitored through direct observation (including walk-throughs) and data collection (performance on common formative assessments of essential standards, common unit assessments and progress monitoring three times a year).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Creating a culture of high expectations for all students
Designs and aligns formative and summative assessments that match learning objectives and lead to mastery.
Uses a variety of assessment tools to monitor student progress, achievement and learning gains.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These evidence-based strategies from the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs) are aligned to our goal to meet the needs of all students and be systematic in our approach to remediating/enriching essential standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide opportunities built into the work day for additional planning/collaboration.

Person Responsible Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)

Develop a data-tracking tool for reporting essential standards by core content area along with common formative assessment results (pre- and post- intervention).

Person Responsible Christina Gagliardi (christina.daschke@okee.k12.fl.us)

Provide training to staff related to the PLC Process.

Person Responsible Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)

Ongoing monitoring of the planning/PLC process/Walk to Intervention.

Person Responsible Kelsey Jarriel (kelsey.jarriel@okee.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring of the MTSS process in conjunction with PLC and WTI.

Person Responsible Greg Potter (gregory.potter@okee.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students with Disabilities continue to be an area that has not responded to interventions as well as we had hoped for a variety of reasons. They are the one ESSA subgroup in need of improvement reported by the state.

Measurable Outcome: We will work to provide more opportunities for students to participate in the general educational setting with a variety of supports (including, but not limited to) walk to intervention and inclusion support.

Monitoring: We will monitor our common unit assessments and progress monitoring as we have for the past two years. We are able to track our performance between school internal documents across cohorts and across multiple years.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Nicole Hurst (nicole.hurst@okee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Creating a culture of high expectations for all students
Designs and aligns formative and summative assessments that match learning objectives and lead to mastery.
Uses a variety of assessment tools to monitor student progress, achievement and learning gains.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These evidence-based strategies from the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs) are aligned to our goal to meet the needs of our SWD and be systematic in our approach to remediating/enriching essential standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Align schedules of inclusion teachers to allow one teacher for ELA and Math for each grade level.

Person Responsible Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)

Utilize Florida Inclusion Network and FDLRS to assist with Inclusive Scheduling.

Person Responsible Jessica Talavera (jessica.talavera@okee.k12.fl.us)

Ongoing progress monitoring (CFAs, CUAs, PMs, etc.) and reporting.

Person Responsible Nicole Hurst (nicole.hurst@okee.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.

Overall our data for discipline appears to be trending in a good direction except for "Drug/Public Order Incidents" (ranked #487 out of 553 for middle schools in the state). Within that category we have seen the largest increase in the number of incidents with tobacco/vapes.

For the current year we have built time into the homeroom for Social-Emotional Learning and will utilize that time to incorporate some mini-lessons about the dangers of tobacco/anti-vaping.

We will evaluate the effectiveness of this initiative with discipline data collected at least monthly (through our leadership team and PBIS Team Meetings), quarterly with student climate surveys and annually as appropriate on district and state surveys.

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 teachers and staff use broad outreach to ensure meaningful stakeholder engagement. We utilize social media in order to try and tell our story. We annually host a Community Day and a School Improvement Presentation Day with our local school board. During these events we share our data, our current plans, and utilize classroom walk-throughs. We leverage several agencies to provide mental health and behavioral health services for tier 1-3 students. We frequently survey our students, faculty and parents to get feedback on our healthy culture. We report out our data with our stakeholder groups to make sure that they continue to spread the good word and work of Osceola Middle School.

Several challenges exist. Since we have experienced the shutdown and exclusions, we must see how our parent and community outreach experiences will change. There has also been a seismic shift in the social justice landscape following the #BLM movement, and we as an entity need to reflect these changes in mentality. Additionally, we are focused on employing more aspects of restorative discipline/justice with our students.

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

Our stakeholders consist of our school leadership team (Downing, Potter, Tomlinson, Hurst, Jarriel, Maggard, Nielson, Talavera). This group works collaboratively to align strategies within the district strategic plan, the school improvement plan, and individual deliberate practice plans.

Our guiding coalition consists of members of our school leadership team, PLC leads and our team leaders. This group sets the message for PLC on this campus, sets goals and provides oversight and feedback for the development and implementation of our plans.

Our PBIS Team works with our SLT and our GC to focus on Tier 1 supports as they impact positive culture and involvement. They utilize school discipline data and survey results to plan activities impacting the students and staff.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				\$12,924.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	1000	310-Professional and Technical Services	0201 - Osceola Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$10,335.00
			Notes: Online professional development conference for 11 staff members to be able to comprehend and implement the PLC process.			
	1000	510-Supplies	0201 - Osceola Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$689.00
			Notes: Online professional development conference for principal to be able to lead the implementation of the PLC process.			
	1000	510-Supplies	0201 - Osceola Middle School	Title IV		\$1,900.00
			Notes: Professional texts to predate training for implementation of the PLC process. Given to members of the leadership team.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
Total:						\$12,924.00