

Marion County Public Schools

Osceola Middle School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Osceola Middle School

526 SE TUSCAWILLA AVE, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Matthew Koff

Start Date for this Principal: 7/10/2018

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	71%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (56%) 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	71%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		A	A

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Koff, Matthew	Principal	The Principal designs and implements a professional development plan which focuses on maximizing the 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 the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction.
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 frequently meet with the school psychologist, social worker, school counselor, and 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 the developmental needs of students, needs assessments, and school, district, and state priorities. Counselors communicated the 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.
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 frequently meet with the school psychologist, social worker, school counselor, and 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.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Schooley, Morgen	School Counselor	School Counselors develop and carry out programs based on the developmental needs of students, needs assessments, and school, district, and state priorities. Counselors communicated the 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.
Carpenter, Constance	Dean	Student Service Managers (SSM) assist in the development of guidelines for proper student conduct and disciplinary policies and procedures that ensure a safe and orderly environment. They maintain comprehensive files on each student requiring disciplinary action and maintain these records for audits. SSM reviews and analyze data to implement strategies with parents, students, and teachers to facilitate student behavior change. Student Service Managers are members of the school-based leadership team and are actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process.
Howe, Erin	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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/10/2018, Matthew Koff

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

28

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

985

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

12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	298	351	329	0	0	0	0	978
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	80	75	0	0	0	0	219
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	79	62	0	0	0	0	190
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	60	68	0	0	0	0	167
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	86	47	0	0	0	0	174
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	97	64	0	0	0	0	228
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	89	48	0	0	0	0	216
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	52	88	72	0	0	0	0	212

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	1	6	0	0	0	0	9
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

Tuesday 7/12/2022

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	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		

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	55%	42%	50%				61%	49%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	48%						55%	54%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%						46%	46%	47%
Math Achievement	61%	30%	36%				69%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	59%						68%	58%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						58%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	45%	53%				65%	46%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	71%	49%	58%				74%	70%	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	2022					
	2019	60%	45%	15%	54%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	58%	46%	12%	52%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
08	2022					
	2019	63%	50%	13%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	62%	46%	16%	55%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	61%	49%	12%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
08	2022					
	2019	60%	41%	19%	46%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	64%	44%	20%	48%	16%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	72%	65%	7%	71%	1%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	54%	46%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	98%	51%	47%	57%	41%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	15	29	25	24	34	27	16	53			
ELL	20	33	33	43	41	23	11	36			
ASN	69	59		83	69		83	90	86		
BLK	30	33	32	32	45	50	29	50	40		
HSP	39	42	30	51	55	36	36	57	46		
MUL	61	44	27	53	45	25	60	64	69		
WHT	65	53	38	71	64	44	72	79	73		
FRL	36	39	34	42	47	34	41	53	38		
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			

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
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
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	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	560
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	77
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Osceola Middle School student proficiency and learning gains declined in English Language Arts (ELA). Student proficiency decreased by 4%, and learning gains decreased by 7% in ELA. Student proficiency in Civics declined by 2% from the previous school year. Students with Disabilities, ELL learners, and African Americans are our subgroups that did not meet the 41% federal index threshold. Math showed an increase both in proficiency and learning gains. Math showed a 1% increase in proficiency and a 9% increase in learning gains. Science showed an increase in proficiency by 3%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest need for improvement is in grades 6-8, Language Arts and Civics. Student learning gains in ELA had a significant decline of 7% from the previous year, and students in the lowest 25% quartile had a 5% decline. Students with Disabilities (28%), ELL learners (33%), and African American (38%) subgroups show the greatest need for improvement within our subgroups.

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

New textbooks from ELA adoption (SAVAS) did not arrive until after the beginning of the year in which a significant amount of planning had already taken place. The ELA-adopted curriculum was not used with fidelity across all ELA classrooms. A focus on using the SAVAS curriculum with fidelity and collaborative planning using the new BEST standards will help increase student achievement.

Having 67% of teachers that had never taught Civics was a contributing factor to the decline. Adding a teacher who has taught Civics and achieved positive growth in proficiency would add strength to the department. A focus on collaborative planning will increase our proficiency rate.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Learning Gains in Math (9%) and Learning Gains in the lowest quartile in Math (6%) increased from the previous tested year. Science (1%) proficiency increased from the previously tested year.

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

An intensive Math teacher was hired and used Math 180 as a resource for students that scored a Level 1 or Level 2 on the previous year's math assessment. After-school tutoring was offered for 12 weeks during the school year.

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

Collaboration practices and strategies will be focused on planning for student engagement while meeting the rigors of our state standards. Osceola Middle School has built into the schedule a 25-minute period, 2 times per week to use IXL software to remediate and /or enrich all students on campus. Teachers will work with all students on reviewing data and setting achievement goals throughout the year.

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 continue to build upon our work of incorporating content area literacy across all subject areas.

Professional development opportunities in lesson planning to ensure active engagement of all learners. This will include using a backward design for planning.

Professional development opportunities for utilizing IXL software as a supplemental resource.

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

Tutoring will be available in both Math and Language Arts with a focus on student subgroups, including students with disabilities, ELL students, African American students, and our lowest quartile students. We will continue to evaluate our observational and quantitative data throughout the school year to determine if any adjustments need to be made to our Professional Development plan.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Osceola has been working on the Rigor, Relevance, and Relationship model. In this model, we were focused on meaningful (Relevance) and thoughtful (Rigor) work. Through data analysis and classroom-focused visits, we realized that standards and student work weren't always aligned. The vision of quality instruction at OMS includes knowing our standards and teaching them to the depth they will be assessed. By implementing a backward design for lesson planning, teachers will develop strategies and tasks that align to the depth of the standard.

Measurable Outcome:
 State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

ELA Proficiency will increase from 55% to 60%
 Math Proficiency will increase from 61% to 64%
 Science Proficiency will increase from 60% to 63%
 Civics Proficiency will increase from 71% to 74%

Monitoring:
 Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This will be monitored by reviewing teacher lesson plans, student work, classroom visits, and school/district common assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Collaborative Lesson Planning and an emphasis on Collective Teacher Efficacy are high-effect strategies that research has proven positively impact student learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for

Through identifying the problem of practice utilizing the five whys, it was determined that the reason instruction wasn't aligned to the standards was due to a lack of focused planning.

selecting this strategy.**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will be provided professional development on lesson planning for student engagement starting in pre-plan week and continuing throughout the year. Staff will create relevant and standards-based lessons with the same rigor with which they will be assessed.

Person Responsible Erin Howe (erin.howe@marion.k12.fl.us)

Implement bi-monthly common collaborative planning to build collective teacher efficacy. Staff will develop common assessments, build lesson plans and review data from common assessments. Principal and Assistant Principals will oversee the scheduling and performance of these meetings.

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

Teachers will have the opportunity to receive feedback from an administrator on their lesson plans through informal conversations and classroom visits.

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Osceola Middle School has had consecutive years of students with disabilities falling under the 41% federal index. Osceola Middle School also failed to meet the 41% federal index with ELL learners and our African American subgroups based on last year's school report card.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

If we provide our underperforming subgroups with appropriate services, appropriate reading interventions, and literacy strategies in the content area based on student learning needs, we will meet the 41% threshold as indicated on the federal index.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The Area of Focus will be monitored by analyzing progress monitoring data, intervention data, IEP data, and individualized goal setting through our mentoring program.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Howe (erin.howe@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Students with Disabilities and ELL students will have their individualized plans reviewed throughout the school year. Appropriate scheduling for SWD and ELL students will be coordinated by our Assistant Principal for Curriculum to provide an appropriate level of support.

Our African American Subgroup will be provided with needed interventions in Math and/or ELA based on their individual needs. All of our underperforming subgroups will have mentoring opportunities to include goal setting.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Research shows that implementing IEPs with appropriate services and ELL accommodations with fidelity increase student learning. In addition, research shows that exposure to reading and Math programs has a positive impact on student learning. Mentoring opportunities with a focus on a positive self-concept have a positive influence on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Professional Development on IXL Software.

Professional Development on Literacy in the content area.

New Cohort of CARPD training

Person Responsible

Erin Howe (erin.howe@marion.k12.fl.us)

Re-Examining IEPs and making sure they are implemented with fidelity.

Person Responsible

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

Mentoring and goal setting with our underperforming subgroups.

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

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Osceola Middle School is not a Title 1 school.

Instructional Staff goes through training on how to provide positive relationships with all students. Students have the opportunity to receive positive office referrals throughout the school year. 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's automated phone calling system 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 to campus for Awards Assemblies, Honor Society Inductions, musical performances, and other special events.

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

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 parents and the 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 parents/children and provide information on community resources.