School District of Osceola County, FL

Horizon Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Horizon Middle School

2020 HAM BROWN RD, Kissimmee, FL 34746

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Megan Gould

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2022

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	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	81%
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: C (52%) 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Osceola County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Horizon Middle School

2020 HAM BROWN RD, Kissimmee, FL 34746

www.osceolaschools.net

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	Yes	81%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	84%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Horizon Middle School strives to support students by helping them grow and develop their critical thinking, their confidence, and their creativity

Provide the school's vision statement.

Horizon Middle School is committed to preparing ALL students to be college and career ready.

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
Gould, Megan	Principal	Oversee the academic and operational systems of the school. Leads the monthly Stocktake Leadership Meetings, where data is discussed and problems of practice are resolved. Evaluates teachers and staff.
Anakotta, Keith	Assistant Principal	Oversee the academic and operational systems of the school. Oversees student services (discipline, MTSS), Guidance, and ELL Support. Evaluates teachers and staff.
Wold, Andrea	Assistant Principal	Oversee the academic and operational systems of the school. Oversees the academic side (MTSS/ master schedule), and ESE student Support. Evaluates teachers and staff. Administrator over PLC's and facilitates monthly stocktake ad leadership meetings.
Hinds, Jacqueline	Reading Coach	Oversee the instructional growth of teachers and the academic growth of students in Literacy.
Holbrook , Elizabeth	Math Coach	Oversee the instructional growth of teachers and the academic growth of students in Math and Science.
Reeser, Phillip	Instructional Coach	Oversees the instructional growth of teachers and academic growth of students through the MTSS process. Manages interventions (WINGS) and monitors student need for interventions.
Vecchio, Vincent	Dean	Oversees student behavioral growth and processes discipline referrals. Facilitates Tier 2/3 interventions and participates on the Threat Assessment team.
Baba, Georgina	School Counselor	Oversee the social and emotional growth of students through the guidance office. Facilitates Tier 2/3 interventions and participates on the Threat Assessment team.
Charles, Alexandra	Staffing Specialist	Oversees the growth of ESE students and implementation of accommodations for students. Ensures we are in compliance with all ESE Laws.
Lopez, Sol	School Counselor	Oversee the social and emotional growth of students through the guidance office. Facilitates Tier 2/3 interventions and participates on the Threat Assessment team.
Mangrum, Naivasha	School Counselor	Oversee the social and emotional growth of students through the guidance office. Facilitates Tier 2/3 interventions and participates on the Threat Assessment team.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
	ELL Compliance Specialist	Oversees the growth of ELL students and the ELL instructional growth of teachers
Roman, Edith	School Counselor	Oversee the social and emotional growth of students through the guidance office. Facilitates Tier 2/3 interventions and participates on the Threat Assessment team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/13/2022, Megan Gould

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.*

1

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.*

60

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

73

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,270

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

29

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

25

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	397	414	461	0	0	0	0	1272
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	97	84	0	0	0	0	214
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	105	175	0	0	0	0	390
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	160	120	149	0	0	0	0	429
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	105	175	0	0	0	0	390

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	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/17/2022

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	409	443	447	0	0	0	0	1299
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	124	103	0	0	0	0	253
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	131	109	0	0	0	0	349
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	136	118	0	0	0	0	392
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4

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	10	46	29	0	0	0	0	85

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	4

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	409	443	447	0	0	0	0	1299
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	124	103	0	0	0	0	253
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	131	109	0	0	0	0	349
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	136	118	0	0	0	0	392
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4

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	10	46	29	0	0	0	0	85

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	4

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	40%	44%	50%				47%	45%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	46%	48%				51%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	36%	38%				36%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	40%	44%	54%				53%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains	51%	54%	58%				57%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	58%	55%				58%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	49%	49%				50%	47%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	68%	71%				74%	72%	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	45%	48%	-3%	54%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	44%	47%	-3%	52%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
08	2022					
	2019	44%	49%	-5%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	47%	45%	2%	55%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	26%	30%	-4%	54%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
08	2022					
	2019	54%	47%	7%	46%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				

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	43%	42%	1%	48%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	98%	62%	36%	67%	31%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	73%	73%	0%	71%	2%
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	84%	49%	35%	61%	23%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	97%	44%	53%	57%	40%

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	17	37	30	19	43	36	16	38			
ELL	27	42	36	31	49	55	35	62	62		
ASN	71	59		67	70		79				
BLK	38	48	29	37	49	52	48	76	75		
HSP	37	46	38	37	49	58	50	71	71		
MUL	40	29		35	29						
WHT	48	45	30	50	59	66	52	75	69		
FRL	36	43	34	37	50	58	44	70	67		
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	22	34	27	24	39	39	33	44			
ELL	22	37	37	31	44	55	24	36	79		
ASN	67	52		70	32		74	83	88		
BLK	36	43	48	31	42	62	33	59	59		
HSP	39	43	39	40	44	58	47	62	72		
MUL	45	41		22	22		40				
WHT	51	54	36	52	41	46	65	73	79		
FRL	37	42	38	38	44	55	45	59	72		
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	26	38	31	29	48	44	14	41			
ELL	31	42	35	36	54	67	21	51	63		
ASN	71	69		73	59		65	86	85		
BLK	39	42	37	49	54	41	43	68	82		
HSP	45	50	35	49	57	62	43	71	71		
MUL	46	42		50	63		44	77	90		
WHT	55	56	39	63	61	53	70	84	89		
FRL	41	47	34	49	57	55	41	69	69		

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	508
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	69
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	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	33
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	55
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	48
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?

ELL-LY students were low in achievement level in ELA; Math; Science; and Civics. ESE students were also low in achievement level in ELA; Math; Science; and Civics.

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

Improvement in ELA Achievement is needed for the 2022- 2023 school year. There will be a focus on ESE students and ELL students making gains towards achievement.

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

Differentiated Instruction for Tier 1 is needed as well as targeted Tier 2 and tier 3 interventions for students.

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

Math learning gains and Civics demonstrated the most growth from 2021-2022.

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

The targeted interventions completed in WINGS intervention time for Math and Civics closed the learning gap for students.

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

Continued work on data analysis and focusing on planning for interventions is needed to accelerate learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development on breaking down data, student groupings, student collaboration, and engagement strategies is needed for 2022-2023.

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

We are focusing on building culture and student belonging on campus to improve student behavior and reduce the amount of time students are out of class.

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 Professional Learning Communities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	If teachers participate in authentic PLCs in all accountability areas, then engaging lesson plans using high yield strategies and best practices can be planned and common formative assessments can be developed to monitor student achievement. Then student achievement will increase
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	ELA, Math, proficiency, and gains will increase by 5% in all groups. Science proficiency will increase by 5%. Social Studies proficiency will increase by 5%. Administration, leadership team, and PLC Leads will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	2. PLC Seven Stages rubric will be used to measure Pre - Mid - End of school year progress of the PLC teams. These surveys will be analyzed, and feedback will be given to the PLC teams individually and collectively. 3. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the PLC administrator and PLC facilitator will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Wold (andrea.wold@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	PLC is defined as "…an ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve" (DuFour, 2006).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	By building the capacity of our PLC leads, PLC's will have productive meetings moving towards stage four or greater creating greater teacher collective efficacy (Hattie: 1.57 effect size).

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.

Monthly PLC lead meetings with links to PLC resources to build capacity of PLC leads.

Person Responsible	Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

Collaborative Teams needs assessment and differentiated professional development on the stages and moving through the PLC process.

Person Responsible	Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

Develop a guiding coalition to help strengthen the PLC school culture and process.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Monitor WINGS interventions for proficiency on common assessments.

Person Responsible   Phillip Reeser (phillip.reeser@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will plan together within their PLCs to incorporate WICOR strategies into their instruction and AVID strategies to support focused engagement for all subgroups

Person Responsible   Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

Schools PLC's teams will meet four times a month during early release and this dedicated PLC time will be spent focused on working together as a team for student success purposes. Teachers will participate in extra hour PLC to focus on data analysis for WINGS interventions.

Person Responsible   Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Student Belonging and PBIS	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Well-implemented programs designed to foster positive outcomes have been found to generate, better test scores and higher graduation rates, and improved social behavior. These competencies include skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions; mindsets, such as thinking positively about how to handle challenges; and habits, such as coming to class prepared. A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships, and supports for learning. It provides the foundation that students need, to develop a positive culture they need to succeed in life.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	2021-2022 Panorama Survey showed a 35% of students answered favorably about school belonging. In 2022- 2023 this question will be increased by 15%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. All surveys will be analyzed to identify schools' interventions that will support a positive culture within the school. 2. The leadership team will review monthly during the Stocktake PBIS, behavior and attendance data for subgroups, and develop inventions as required.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Keith Anakotta (keith.anakotta@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. It is essential to assess individuals and be focused and flexible to allow for meeting these different needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.	A positive culture and environment are not based on prescribed curricula; instead, it is an approach that reflects a set of teaching strategies and practices that are student-centered. Staff must use teaching techniques that build on students' current knowledge and skills (Gardner, 1983).

Describe the resources/ criteria used for 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.

Panorama/ Kagan (Win-Win) Target Strategies planned each month to increase student to teacher relationships and student to student relationships and taught to staff during monthly staff PD sessions.

Person Responsible   Vincent Vecchio (vincent.vecchio@osceolaschools.net)

PD on cultural awareness/ interactions during the first quarter to ensure proper interactions.

Person Responsible   Georgina Baba (georgina.baba@osceolaschools.net)

Increase before and after school club offerings and opportunities for students to get to know each outher outside of the classroom.

Person Responsible   Katelyn Bocarro (katelyn.bocarro@osceolaschools.net)

Student and staff spirit days planned monthly as well as PBIS celebrations (monthly and quarterly).

Person Responsible   Andrea Wold (andrea.wold@osceolaschools.net)

Implementation of AVID and AVID XL to promote college and career readiness for students in grades 6-8. Implement student to student collaboration in support of C in WICOR to prepare students to a post-secondary goals.

Person Responsible   Keith Anakotta (keith.anakotta@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Given the 2021 -2022 school data finding that only 40% of students were proficient in math, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematic achievement for all students
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Math, proficiency, and gains will increase by 5% in all groups
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. Administration, leadership team, and Math Coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly. 2. Administrative team will monitor the use of questioning in the classroom that develops the appropriate stage of fluency for the grade-level benchmarks. Questions should be focused on Costa's higher levels of questions (Inquiry). 3. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Math Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Wold (andrea.wold@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Differentiated Instruction based on student data from ALEKS and FAST testing to drive instruction and target student needs in Mathematics.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Differentiated Instruction is a researched based strategy that allows students at all levels to access curriculum suited to their needs. (Tomlinson)

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 provide scaffolding for students with skills gaps on new content and plan instruction based on student needs.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

ELL and ESE strategies will be embedded into the lesson plans and used with students to support learning.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Professional Development on station rotation, strategic groupings, and instructional technology use during the first semester with follow up and side by side coaching and modeling.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will engage in quarterly content previews and PD on our new curriculum resources.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will plan interventions during WINGS to focus on closing the achievement gap for struggling students.

Person Responsible   Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Given the 2021 -2022 school data finding that only 40% of students were proficient in ELA, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of Literacy achievement for all students
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	ELA, proficiency, and gains will increase by 5% in all groups
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. Administration, leadership team, and ELA Coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLC Team weekly. 2. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Literacy Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus. 3. Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on formative assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Wold (andrea.wold@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision-making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement. If teachers effectively provide opportunities for students to actively participate in academic discourse through collaborative structures, engage in active learning experiences then student engagement and learning will increase.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous, and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003) Active learning experiences: Students who are "doing" are learning. Providing opportunities for students to investigate through inquiry, participate in collaborative structures, writing for understanding and reading especially if it is connected and relevant to their lives. (WICOR (AVID)

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 Station Rotation, Instructional Technology; Training by the Literacy Coach on the effectiveness of increased student engagement in relation to student achievement will be offered throughout the year to struggling teachers

Person Responsible   Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

Staff will use progress monitoring data, classroom observations, and, scoring rubrics to identify individual student needs

Person Responsible   Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

Staff will utilize high-quality ELA instructional materials which are found in the curriculum unit plans

Person Responsible   Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

Students will participate in targeted intervention Tier 1,2, & 3 through in class interventions and WINGS time.

Person Responsible   Phillip Reeser (phillip.reeser@osceolaschools.net)

Meetings weekly/bi-monthly with the MTSS coach to review student data and interventions to determine the effectiveness of academic literacy and math support for Tier 1, 2, & 3 students

Person Responsible   Phillip Reeser (phillip.reeser@osceolaschools.net)

The ELL and ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of ESOL compliance specialist and RCS ensuring students are supported in all courses by providing ELL and ESE instructional strategies and professional development for teachers

Person Responsible   Alexandra Charles (alexandra.charles@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will plan interventions during WINGS to focus on closing the achievement gap for struggling students.

Person Responsible   Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	If teachers effectively provide opportunities for students to actively participate in academic discourse through collaborative structures, engage in active learning experiences (such as labs, activities, and investigations), and authentically use their interactive science notebook to process their learning, then student engagement and learning will increase.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Science proficiency will increase by 5%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. Administration, leadership team, coaches, and teachers (self-monitor) will work together to monitor instruction as well as work in PLCs to plan for instruction. 2. Formative assessments as well as district administered progress monitoring assessments (NWEA, PM, and mock) will be used to measure Pre - Mid - End of school year progress of student learning. Data will be analyzed and used to plan professional learning and coaching for teachers based on individual and small group needs. 3. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the leadership and/or coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Wold (andrea.wold@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Participate in academic discourse through collaborative structures • Engage in active learning experiences • Process learning using interactive science notebooks
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Academic discourse through collaborative structures: When students talk with each other about their ideas, their understanding, and questions they have, they not only process new knowledge verbally, but also engage in the topic and are empowered to express their own thoughts (in ideal settings, without judgement and with clear prompt and structure). WICOR (AVID) o Active learning experiences: Students who are "doing" are learning. Providing opportunities for students to investigate through inquiry, participate in experiments, develop models, and engage in simulations and activities remember the experience, especially if it is connected and relevant to their lives. WICOR (AVID) o Interactive science notebooks: Interactive science notebooks provide a safe place for students to process their learning, record knowledge, connect ideas, use as a reference and make their own. It helps students build confidence as they develop understanding through writing, drawing, recording ideas, collecting data, synthesizing information, and more. WICOR (AVID)

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 participate in PD that will AVID strategies including Kagan, WICOR , Cornell notes and interactive notebooks

Person Responsible   Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Implement student to student structured collaboration in 75% of the planned lessons.

Person Responsible   Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Side by side coaching and modeling cycles with teachers to improve instructional practices.

Person Responsible   Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will plan interventions during WINGS to focus on closing the achievement gap for struggling students.

Person Responsible   Elizabeth Holbrook (elizabeth.holbrook@osceolaschools.net)

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.

Horizon is a PBIS Model School and our expectations are S.O.A.R. Students will Strive for Success, Own their actions, have a positive Attitude, and show Respect. We are focusing on student-teacher relationships and a sense of belonging on campus by implementing WIN-WIN discipline strategies and building student capacity for student-student relationships through collaborative structures.

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

Students- following SOAR expectations and building relationships with others.
Teachers and Staff- Using positive language and establishing Win-Win discipline practices to support our PBIS initiative.
Parents and community members - Reinforcing school procedures and expectations at home.