Kissimmee Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Kissimmee Middle School

2410 DYER BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Eugenia Rolando

Start Date for this Principal: 8/14/2022

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)	100%
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 (47%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (52%)
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

Kissimmee Middle School

2410 DYER BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34741

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	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	92%

School Grades History

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

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.

We will become community of professionals who believe in collaboration to create relevant, rigorous learning experiences for all students while building positive relationships with them.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will be emotionally, socially, and academically prepared for COLLEGE and CAREER beyond high school

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
Rolando, Eugenia	Principal	As an instructional Leader, Dr. Rolando's duties are to create safe, student-centered, learning environments that maximize student academic achievement and socio-emotional well-being. Dr. Rolando supervises the design of the master schedule, hires and evaluates instructional personnel, and works closely with instructional coaches and mentors to ensure students receive high quality instruction that is adequate for their needs. Dr. Rolando is the contact administrator for accountability. Dr. Rolando is also responsible for facilities.
Melvin, Michael	Assistant Principal	Mr. Melvin is responsible for leading the school operations, safety, technology, and assessment. He is the contact administrator for Panorama Surveys, and compliance with Title I. As an instructional leader, Mr. Melvin promotes and evaluates teacher effectiveness together with the Principal and other Assistant Principals.
Taylor, Michael	Assistant Principal	Dr. Taylor is responsible for student discipline and attendance and promoting a positive learning environment through PBIS initiative. As an instructional leader, Dr. Taylor promotes and evaluates teacher effectiveness together with the Principal and other Assistant Principals.
Collin, Amy	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Collin is the Assistant Principal for Instruction responsible for building and maintaining the school's master schedule. She is also the administrator contact for Professional Learning Communities, AVID, and Stocktake. The Stocktake process allows the school leadership team to design action steps to accomplish the school improvement plan and monitor the effectiveness of implementation. As an instructional leader, Mrs. Collin promotes and evaluates teacher effectiveness together with the Principal and other Assistant Principals.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 8/14/2022, Eugenia Rolando

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.*
0

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.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
100

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,337

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
39

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
37

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	432	408	435	0	0	0	0	1275
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	98	115	0	0	0	0	313
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	85	88	0	0	0	0	200
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	145	163	0	0	0	0	473
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	186	156	156	0	0	0	0	498
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	57	78	0	0	0	0	190

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	135	124	114	0	0	0	0	373

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	35	35	0	0	0	0	99

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/8/2022

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	456	449	458	0	0	0	0	1363
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	60	72	0	0	0	0	230
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	50	51	0	0	0	0	118
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	17	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	91	106	0	0	0	0	328
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	107	107	0	0	0	0	336
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	74	81	0	0	0	0	155

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	42	39	33	0	0	0	0	114

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	456	449	458	0	0	0	0	1363
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	60	72	0	0	0	0	230
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	50	51	0	0	0	0	118
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	17	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	91	106	0	0	0	0	328
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	107	107	0	0	0	0	336
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	81	0	0	0	0	155

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	42	39	33	0	0	0	0	114

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	32%	44%	50%				37%	45%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	43%						46%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						47%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	33%	35%	36%				41%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains	50%						52%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						57%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	32%	44%	53%				39%	47%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	56%	54%	58%				70%	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	31%	48%	-17%	54%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	30%	47%	-17%	52%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
08	2022					
	2019	30%	49%	-19%	56%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	28%	45%	-17%	55%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	20%	30%	-10%	54%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
08	2022					
	2019	38%	47%	-9%	46%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

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	30%	42%	-12%	48%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	95%	62%	33%	67%	28%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	64%	73%	-9%	71%	-7%

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	88%	49%	39%	61%	27%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	44%	56%	57%	43%

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	22	39	31	22	48	43	18	31			
ELL	28	41	36	29	48	53	23	46	81		
ASN	45	50		66	80		50	92			
BLK	30	44	40	29	48	63	36	58			
HSP	31	42	37	32	49	55	30	52	84		
MUL	24	50		24	50						
WHT	42	47	46	40	53	50	33	70	85		
FRL	28	40	37	29	46	53	29	55	80		
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	39	31	21	33	31	21	33			
ELL	22	42	46	22	36	42	22	51	86		

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	53	68		55	50		60				
BLK	34	37	43	26	32	36	23	65	64		
HSP	30	43	44	27	35	38	32	59	82		
MUL	20	31		16	47						
WHT	40	45	29	43	34	39	41	79	89		
FRL	28	39	37	25	32	34	31	57	83		
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	28	42	35	32	52	49	16	41			
ELL	25	43	45	29	53	60	22	59	81		
ASN	72	47		67	59						
BLK	40	48	43	39	45	39	43	65	95		
HSP	34	45	49	41	53	58	38	70	86		
MUL	29	33		23	21						
WHT	46	51	44	46	53	64	38	72	88		
FRL	33	43	44	38	51	56	34	69	88		

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	47
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	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	467
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	43
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	64
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	44
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	46
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	37
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	52
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	43
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?

There is low proficiency (and literacy) across all grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas.

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

Based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, the data components that need the greatest improvement are ELA Achievement, Social Studies Achievement, and Science 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?

Contributing factors: teacher shortage (ELA 7th grade); teacher and student absenteeism (Covid related); lack of rigor in instruction.

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

High school Acceleration and learning gains in math of the lowest 25% showed the most improvement by exceeding and meeting the state average, respectively.

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

Contributing factors: consistency among teachers, Professional Development opportunities to preview content, support from instructional coach.

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

The strategies that will need to be implemented to accelerate learning: provide professional development on standards-based rigorous instruction; collaboration among team members to identify:
-essential standards
-common assessment
-data analysis
-differentiation of instruction (remediation and enrichment)

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.

Share best instructional practices (AVID - WICOR) on a weekly basis.
Provide support through instructional mentors on specific teachers' needs.
Participate in weekly PLC meetings and provide support as needed.
Offer external PD such as KAGAN strategies.
Provide ongoing feedback.

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

Teachers will be offered the opportunity to work an extra hour per week to engage in the PLC process with their team. Tutoring will be offered before and after school in all content areas.

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 the process of Professional Learning Communities 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 proficiency will increase by 7% in all groups. Math proficiency will increase by 7% in all groups. Science proficiency will increase by 7%. Social Studies proficiency will increase by 10%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. 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. 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 process 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:	Amy Collin (amy.collin@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). Collective efficacy, which is the outcome of a highly-effective PLC, has a positive effect size of 1.57 which exceeds the efficacy of any other strategy (Visible Learning, 2018).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Set clear objectives that are focused on student learning. The PLC model is grounded in the assumption that building teachers' competencies will lead to improved academic, behavioral, or social outcomes for students. Consequently, student learning is both the foundation and evidence of an effective PLC.

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.

1. PLC teams will develop and implement formulated meeting Collective Commitments (NORMs) that are agreed upon and adhered to by all team members during all meetings.

Person Responsible	Sarah McKenney (sarah.mckenney@osceolaschools.net)

2. Schools PLC 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.

Person Responsible	Sarah McKenney (sarah.mckenney@osceolaschools.net)

3. Current Data will be used by each PLC team for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting, and revising plans (if applicable) on the course progression of individual students' needs.

Person Responsible   Sarah McKenney (sarah.mckenney@osceolaschools.net)

4. Mentoring will be conducted by the PLC administrator and PLC facilitator for teams who are struggling, and additional support will be given so they become an effective collaborative team focused on the work.

Person Responsible   Amy Collin (amy.collin@osceolaschools.net)

5. 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   Amy Collin (amy.collin@osceolaschools.net)

6. Each grade level or content area team will have an embedded leadership team member to monitor and assist in the process.

Person Responsible   Eugenia Rolando (eugenia.rolando@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to	
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 only 29% of students answered favorably about school climate. In 2022-2023 this question will be increased by 10%. 2021-2022 Teacher Insight Survey showed 43% of teachers answered favorably about school learning environment, compared to 67% of teachers in top quartile schools. In 2022-2023 this question will be increased by 10%.
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 and learning environment within the school. 2. During the monthly Stocktake process, and most frequent MTSS process, the leadership team will review behavior and attendance data for subgroups, and develop PBIS inventions as required.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Taylor (michael.taylor@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Students need different levels of support to thrive in middle school. School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is a systems approach to establishing the social culture and behavioral supports needed for all children in a school to achieve both social and academic success. PBIS utilizes a tiered support model where interventions are targeted to meet students' specific needs and exclusionary practices are explored as a last resort after corrective responses have been tried. The framework has three tiers of evidence-based strategies: universal interventions, targeted interventions, and intensive individualized interventions. Implementation of the framework includes providing supports at the universal level first and then moving on to the subsequent tiers as students with greater needs are identified (AASA, 2018)

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

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.

1. Teacher will plan to build an environment of belonging by planning activities that are engaging and relevant to students while identifying and building on students' individual assets and, passions.

Person Responsible Michael Taylor (michael.taylor@osceolaschools.net)

2. Teachers will use active learning strategies like hands-on, experiential, and project-based activities while integrating behavior strategies such as self-management, self-confidence, self-efficacy, and social awareness where applicable.

Person Responsible Michael Taylor (michael.taylor@osceolaschools.net)

3. Teachers will encourage and facilitate students' shared decision-making through consensus, peer learning and teaching - collaborative learning.

Person Responsible Michael Taylor (michael.taylor@osceolaschools.net)

PBIS training will be conducted by the district and the school PBIS leadership team for all staff throughout the year to promote the implementation of PBIS with fidelity throughout all aspects of the school. As a result, the school will develop structures, relationships, and learning opportunities that support a positive culture for students and staff development.

Person Responsible Michael Taylor (michael.taylor@osceolaschools.net)

Create a Post-Secondary Culture by promoting college and career readiness through the schoolwide implementation of AVID strategies, celebrating College Week, and hosting a College Night for families.

Person Responsible Amy Collin (amy.collin@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 33% 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 will increase by 7% 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 and support the collaborative teams in the PLC process to embrace and master instruction of BEST Standards. 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:	Eugenia Rolando (eugenia.rolando@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will implement Best standards by adopting: • Progression of content across strands is purposeful so benchmarks are not taught in isolation • Intentional balance of conceptual understanding and procedural fluency • Real-world applications intertwined within concepts for relevance They will: 1-Establish mathematics goals to focus learning (Organization) 2-Implement tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving (Inquiry) 3-Use and connect mathematical representations to deepen understanding of mathematics concepts and procedures and as tools for problem solving (I) 4-Facilitate meaningful mathematical discourse among students (Collaboration) 5-Pose purposeful questions to assess and advance students' reasoning and sense making (I) 6-Build procedural fluency from conceptual understanding so that students, over time, become skillful in using procedures flexibly as they solve contextual and mathematical problems (I, Reading, Writing)

7-Support productive struggle in learning mathematics (I, R, W)

8-Elicit and use evidence of student thinking to assess progress toward mathematical understanding (I)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2014) promotes these effective mathematics teaching practices. These practices are associated to WICOR AVID strategies supported by the Osceola School District.

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.

Collaborative Planning: by working in Professional Learning Communities supported by the Math Coach, teachers can engage in the cycle of creating common assessments, planning for rigorous instruction, assessing, analyzing data, and providing remediation or enrichment opportunities.

Person Responsible	Eugenia Rolando (eugenia.rolando@osceolaschools.net)

Professional development will be conducted throughout the year that focuses on the development of fluency across grade levels through Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards (MTR) training. The math coach and district-based team will provide professional development opportunities throughout the school year. Teachers will engage in continuous cycle of learning within the school.

Person Responsible	Eugenia Rolando (eugenia.rolando@osceolaschools.net)

Standards Aligned Instruction will be deliberate as teachers will ensure the task students are required to complete promotes mastery of the essential standard being targeted. Standard-task alignment will be monitored in walkthrough.

Instruction will include the 8 mathematical practices listed above, with outcomes representing high expectations and rigor that connect to a sequence of learning. Students will be cognitively engaged in instruction using high-quality questioning and discussion techniques, supported by feedback, and the ability to self-assess progress related to the outcome. Students will learn multiple problem-solving strategies and high-order thinking concepts using visual representations. Students will engage in purposeful collaboration and meaningful mathematical discourse.

Person Responsible	Eugenia Rolando (eugenia.rolando@osceolaschools.net)

Differentiation: while planning for instruction, teachers will adopt adequate strategies for struggling students, students with learning disabilities, and English Language Learners. Strategies will include WICOR, the SIOP model, recently adopted by the district, and dual language instruction in 7th grade.

Additionally, teachers will use formative assessment data to identify student needs related to the grade level fluency benchmarks and provide targeted remediation based on the identified needs of the student using intervention programs such as Osceola Numeracy Project or Hand2Mind Numbers & Operations Intervention) resources.

Person Responsible	Eugenia Rolando (eugenia.rolando@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will use progress monitoring data and classroom observations to identify individual student needs, offer remediation and/or additional intervention time.

Person Responsible	Eugenia Rolando (eugenia.rolando@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 33% 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 7% 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 and support the collaborative teams in the PLC process to embrace and master instruction of BEST Standards. 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 rigor of instruction through classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on formative assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Melvin (michael.melvin@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The ELA team has several new teachers, who do not have the background in the Marzano's instructional framework or BEST Florida Standards. BEST stands for Benchmarks of Excellent Student Thinking. The skills and knowledge captured in the ELA/literacy BEST standards are designed to prepare students for life outside the classroom. Teachers will learn the Marzano Framework while adopting WICOR strategies. WICOR stands for Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading. They are the foundation for AVID, which promotes college and career readiness.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Marzano's comprehensive instructional framework encompasses research-based standards-based planning, standards-based instruction, and conditions for learning, all of which are conducive to maximizing learning. The framework is founded on teacher collaboration in Professional Learning Communities. WICOR strategies are embedded in the Marzano's instructional framework and are part of the non-evaluative school trend instrument. These complementary strategies are likely to yield better student and teacher outcomes.

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.

Collaborative Planning: by working in Professional Learning Communities supported by the Literacy Coach, teachers will engage in the cycle of creating common assessments, planning for instruction, assessing, analyzing data, and providing remediation or enrichment opportunities.

Considering the large number of non-proficient students that require additional support to become proficient readers, Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices need refining. Professional Learning Communities will work with the Literacy Coach to design instruction with adequate scaffolds and access to background knowledge.

Person Responsible   Michael Melvin (michael.melvin@osceolaschools.net)

Standards Aligned Instruction will be deliberate as teachers will ensure the task students are required to complete promotes mastery of the BEST standard being targeted. These standards include critical-thinking skills and the ability to closely and attentively read texts in a way that will help them understand and enjoy complex works of literature. Teachers will utilize high-quality ELA instructional materials which are found in the curriculum unit plans.

Standard-task alignment will be monitored in walkthroughs.

Person Responsible   Michael Melvin (michael.melvin@osceolaschools.net)

Differentiation: while planning for instruction, teachers will adopt best strategies for struggling students, students with learning disabilities, and English Language Learners. Strategies from the SIOP model.

Person Responsible   Michael Melvin (michael.melvin@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will use progress monitoring data and classroom observations to identify individual student needs, offer remediation and/or additional intervention time.

Person Responsible   Michael Melvin (michael.melvin@osceolaschools.net)

Professional development will be conducted throughout the year that focuses on both content (BEST Standards) and best instructional practices. Literacy coach and district-based team will provide professional development opportunities throughout the school year. Teachers will engage in continuous cycle of learning within the school.

Person Responsible   Michael Melvin (michael.melvin@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 7%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. Administration, instructional coaches, and Professional Learning Community leaders will work together to support and monitor planning and implementation of rigorous standards-based 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:	Eugenia Rolando (eugenia.rolando@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Professional Learning Communities will continue embracing the Marzano framework and WICOR AVID strategies, in particular students will: • Participate in academic discourse through collaborative structures • Engage in active, inquiry-based 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.	o Academic discourse through collaborative structures: When students talk with each other about their ideas, their understanding, and questions, they process new knowledge verbally while being empowered to express their own thoughts. 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 (which is possible in almost all science content). 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 in science as they develop an 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.

Collaborative Planning: by working in Professional Learning Communities, teachers will engage in the cycle of creating common assessments, planning for instruction, assessing, analyzing data, and providing remediation or enrichment opportunities. Use district-adopted curriculum and curriculum unit plans to guide the process.

Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices need refining given the large number of non-proficient students. Building vocabulary and accessing prior knowledge while using WICOR strategies on a regular basis can help students solidify their understanding of essential science concepts.

Person Responsible   Eugenia Rolando (eugenia.rolando@osceolaschools.net)

Professional development: Teachers will learn and implement AVID strategies, WICOR, including Inquiry based learning, Cornell notes, and interactive notebooks. Teachers will work with district-based science team to develop professional learning that addresses areas of need specific to science instructional practice and strategies. Teachers will engage in continuous cycle of learning within the school.

Person Responsible   Eugenia Rolando (eugenia.rolando@osceolaschools.net)

Differentiation: while planning for instruction, teachers will adopt adequate strategies for struggling students, students with learning disabilities, and English Language Learners. Strategies will include WICOR, the SIOP model, recently adopted by the district, and dual language instruction in 6th grade.

Person Responsible   Eugenia Rolando (eugenia.rolando@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will use progress monitoring data and classroom observations to identify individual student needs, offer remediation and/or additional intervention time.

Person Responsible   Eugenia Rolando (eugenia.rolando@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.

At the beginning of the school year, the leadership team will teach and re-teach schoolwide expectation to ensure students maximize their learning in school.
In addition to implementing PBIS with fidelity, KMS will have a Restorative Coach who will work with at risk-students to establish positive relationships among students and teachers and promote student success.
School counselors will address students who are at risk as identified by the Panorama Survey.
Teachers will promote social-emotional learning and sense of belonging by embedding team-building activities in their daily practices.
To improve the environment, deans and administrators' offices have been relocated to all buildings to increase visibility and accessibility.

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

PBIS - Dr. Taylor, Mrs. Berry, Ms. Johnson, Mr. Guilbaud.
School COunselors - Mrs. Valles, Ms. Rivera, Ms. Reynolds, Ms. Burgos
Restorative Coach - Ms. Johnson