

School District of Osceola County, FL

# Neptune Middle School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Neptune Middle School

2727 NEPTUNE RD, Kissimmee, FL 34744

www.osceolaschools.net

## Demographics

Principal: Thomas Rademacher

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (58%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (54%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Neptune Middle School

2727 NEPTUNE RD, Kissimmee, FL 34744

[www.osceolaschools.net](http://www.osceolaschools.net)

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	96%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	88%

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>
<b>Grade</b>	B	B	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.

Excellence for all . . . whatever it takes.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Education which inspires all students to achieve their highest potential.

### 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
Rademacher, Thomas	Principal	The principal oversees the vision and mission of the school. Assigns the roles and responsibilities of the leadership team to ensure the SIP is being monitored. Conducts a monthly Stocktake to monitor the SIP and make adjustments based on the data.
Crisp, Kara	Assistant Principal	In charge of ensuring students are in the appropriate classes through master scheduling. Oversees the MTSS/Intervention process, PLC process, Stoketake Facilitator, and Science Goals.
Franceschi, Frankie	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal that oversees technology, SS/Civics, and Title 1.
Wilson, Lisa	Instructional Coach	In charge of the math goal. Supports the Math PLC to ensure students are being supported on all levels and monitors progress towards the math goals.
Rosario, Kacie	Staffing Specialist	RCS overseeing IEP staffing and accommodations.
Lovegrove, Alexandria	Instructional Coach	In charge of the literacy goal and ensuring literacy schoolwide. Supports ELA/Reading PLCs to ensure students are being supported on all levels and monitors progress towards the goals.
Marcano, Alicia	Instructional Coach	Tracking each PLC as they move through the 7 stages. Serves as the MTSS Coach.
Forty Way, Monica	Instructional Coach	Oversees culture and environment goals. Ensures the elective team is progressing through the PLC process. Supports all new teachers with instruction and certification.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 8/1/2018, Thomas Rademacher

**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.*

25

**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.*

36

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

63

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

965

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

13

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

15

### 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	291	324	350	0	0	0	0	965
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	70	106	0	0	0	0	240
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	68	68	0	0	0	0	183
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	84	109	0	0	0	0	261
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	87	113	0	0	0	0	285
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	5	0	0	0	0	20



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	61	78	87	0	0	0	0	226

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	8

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/18/2022

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	326	324	359	0	0	0	0	1009
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	63	81	0	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	11	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	8	7	0	0	0	0	16

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	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	326	324	359	0	0	0	0	1009
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	70	106	0	0	0	0	240
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	68	68	0	0	0	0	183
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	34	43	60	0	0	0	0	137

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	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	52%	44%	50%				52%	45%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						55%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						49%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	51%	35%	36%				55%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains	61%						58%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%						56%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	44%	53%				52%	47%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	65%	54%	58%				81%	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.**

<b>ELA</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2022					
	2019	50%	48%	2%	54%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	52%	47%	5%	52%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
08	2022					
	2019	45%	49%	-4%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2022					
	2019	53%	45%	8%	55%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	23%	30%	-7%	54%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
08	2022					
	2019	44%	47%	-3%	46%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	42%	42%	0%	48%	-6%
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	79%	73%	6%	71%	8%
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	93%	49%	44%	61%	32%
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	24	37	26	29	57	47	23	28			
ELL	33	50	35	32	57	59	27	43	86		
ASN	65	67		71	67		55				
BLK	46	54	43	44	60	72	37	41	73		
HSP	50	56	39	49	61	61	50	64	88		
MUL	54	64		42	48		50	91			
WHT	62	60	35	65	67	65	70	79	93		
FRL	44	51	35	42	54	54	41	56	84		
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	28	44	37	29	40	36	35	64			
ELL	25	45	45	28	41	40	31	73	65		

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	76		79	65		100				
BLK	44	49	38	44	37	33	50	89	92		
HSP	46	51	47	47	46	42	53	83	77		
MUL	62	56		57	50						
WHT	63	55	45	67	57	55	78	95	89		
FRL	41	47	43	42	41	38	52	83	76		

  

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	24	51	45	28	48	47	28	55			
ELL	30	47	46	34	49	52	21	57	77		
ASN	65	62		81	58		58	85	100		
BLK	46	54	46	41	59	61	33	88			
HSP	49	53	49	51	56	52	50	77	90		
MUL	58	60		56	74		53	93			
WHT	64	60	49	72	66	76	66	91	94		
FRL	47	53	46	49	56	54	46	78	90		

**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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	576
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

**Subgroup Data**

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
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	65
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	52
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	56
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	58
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	66
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	52
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?**

SWD students lacking proficiency in ELA and Math.

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

SWD students learning gains and proficiency.

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

Poor attendance by SWD students and lengthy absences of general education and ESE support teachers due to illness and health concerns. Support with attendance initiatives for SWD students. Support for general education and ESE support teachers of SWD to provide accommodations and supports.

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

Learning gains in Math.

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

Int. Math course for all level 1 students and Math interventions scheduled into students' day.

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

Reading and Math interventions during intervention period. Lowest 25% will be scheduled into Intensive Reading and Intensive Math.

**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 facilitated by academic coaches and district support coaches in Aleks, Beable, and Achieve programs.

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

Support for all level 1 Math students through Intensive Math. Support for all level 2 Math students in intervention period. Support for all level 1 Reading students through Intensive Reading and intervention period.

**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. This will result in an increase in student achievement.

**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 4% in all groups.  
 Science proficiency will increase by 4%  
 Social Studies proficiency will increase by 4%

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 weekly.

**Monitoring:**

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

PLC Seven Stages rubric will be used to measure beginning, middle, and end of year PLC ratings for growth. This information will be used to offer feedback to the PLCs collectively and individually.

School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the PLC Facilitator will report progress to the principal on the area of focus.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Alicia Marcano (alicia.marcano@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" (Defour, 2006)

**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 based on student learning. The PLC model is grounded in the idea that building teachers' competencies will lead to improved academic, behavioral, or social outcomes for students. 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.

School leaders' moderate conversations and model decision making strategies in PLCs.

**Person Responsible**

Alicia Marcano (alicia.marcano@osceolaschools.net)

Provide professional development on how to use data to drive instruction and to build shared knowledge of the PLC process.

**Person Responsible**

Alicia Marcano (alicia.marcano@osceolaschools.net)

PLCs will meet weekly with the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising progression of individual needs of a collaborative team.

**Person Responsible**

Alicia Marcano (alicia.marcano@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** Alicia Marcano (alicia.marcano@osceolaschools.net)

School leaders' moderate conversations and model decision making strategies in PLCs.

**Person Responsible** Alicia Marcano (alicia.marcano@osceolaschools.net)

Provide professional development on how to use data to drive instruction and to build shared knowledge of the PLC process.

**Person Responsible** Alicia Marcano (alicia.marcano@osceolaschools.net)

PLCs will meet weekly with the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising progression of individual needs of a collaborative team.

**Person Responsible** Alicia Marcano (alicia.marcano@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** Alicia Marcano (alicia.marcano@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 life lessons for social and emotional health are associated with positive outcomes, ranging from better test scores and higher graduation rates to improved social behavior. Social-emotional 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 the social, emotional, and academic competencies they need to succeed in life. There is a schoolwide focus on AVID to promote students working towards a goal that will set them up for success post-secondary education.

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

2021-22 SEL Climate Survey showed 41% of students answered favorable for school belonging. In 2022-2023 the percent of students answering this question favorably will increase by 5%.

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

The leadership team will review data monthly during Stocktake. This data will include behavior and attendance data. In addition, all surveys will be analyzed to identify interventions and supports that will foster a positive culture within the school.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Monica Forty Way (monica.fortyway@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 individual learning styles and be flexible in time management to allow for meeting these different needs.

**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.

Teachers and staff will plan activities that are engaging and relevant to students. Identifying and building on students' individual assets and, passions.

**Person Responsible** Monica Forty Way (monica.fortyway@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will plan to build an environment of belonging.

**Person Responsible** Monica Forty Way (monica.fortyway@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will use active learning strategies like hands-on, experiential, and project-based activities.

**Person Responsible** Monica Forty Way (monica.fortyway@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will integrate behavior strategies into their curriculum, such as self-management, self-confidence, self-efficacy, and social awareness where applicable.

**Person Responsible** Monica Forty Way (monica.fortyway@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will facilitate peer learning and teaching - collaborative learning.

**Person Responsible** Monica Forty Way (monica.fortyway@osceolaschools.net)

PBIS will be implemented with fidelity throughout all aspects of the school and monitored through the PBIS leadership team and reported out at monthly Stocktake.

**Person Responsible** Monica Forty Way (monica.fortyway@osceolaschools.net)

PBIS training will be conducted by the district and the school PBIS leadership team for all staff throughout the year.

**Person Responsible** Monica Forty Way (monica.fortyway@osceolaschools.net)

There will be a schoolwide focus on post-secondary education through AVID.

**Person Responsible** Monica Forty Way (monica.fortyway@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 2021-22 school data finding that only 51% of students were proficient in math, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematics achievement for all students.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The outcome for 2022-23 is to increase math proficiency by 4%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Aleks, NWEA, FAST data will be used to monitor students. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Math Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus using this data.

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.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lisa Wilson (lisa.wilson@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

The 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 assessments 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.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Studies show that the 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 assessments to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Marzano (2003), Reeves (2010), Dufour, et al (2010)

**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/Professional Learning Communities - Math Coach will attend grade level PLCs and help with data desegregation, backward planning, common assessments and guidance on curriculum.

**Person Responsible**

Lisa Wilson (lisa.wilson@osceolaschools.net)

Differentiation, Small Group Instruction, Tier 2&3 Instructional Interventions - Utilize ALEKS and Numeracy Project data to differentiate students into groups for tier 2 & 3 interventions.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Wilson (lisa.wilson@osceolaschools.net)

Standards Aligned Instruction - PDs given on Standards and CUPs to ensure standards aligned instruction.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Wilson (lisa.wilson@osceolaschools.net)

Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices (Rigor, Expectations, Engagement) - WICOR strategies used in instruction as well as cornerstone tasks embedded in the CUPs.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Wilson (lisa.wilson@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.**

Based on the 2021-22 school data, ELA proficiency was 52%. productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of ELA achievement for all students.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The outcome for 2022-23 is to increase ELA proficiency by 4%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Achieve, Dibels, Beable, and FAST data will be used to monitor students. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Literacy Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus using this data.

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.

Leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on formative assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Alexandria Lovegrove (alexandria.lovegrove@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 MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.

**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).

**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/Professional Learning Communities - Reading Coach will attend grade level PLCs and help with data desegregation, backward planning, common assessments and guidance on curriculum.

**Person Responsible**

Alexandria Lovegrove (alexandria.lovegrove@osceolaschools.net)

Differentiation, Small Group Instruction, Tier 2&3 Instructional Interventions - Utilize Beable and Achieve data to differentiate students into groups for tier 2 & 3 interventions. Tier interventions utilizing Words Thier Way.

**Person Responsible** Alexandria Lovegrove (alexandria.lovegrove@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning - Reading Coach will conduct coaching cycles to determine needs for professional development and follow up with classroom walkthroughs to monitor implementation.

**Person Responsible** Alexandria Lovegrove (alexandria.lovegrove@osceolaschools.net)

Standards Aligned Instruction - PDs given on Standards and CUPs to ensure standards aligned instruction.

**Person Responsible** Alexandria Lovegrove (alexandria.lovegrove@osceolaschools.net)

5. Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices (Rigor, Expectations, Engagement) - WICOR strategies used in instruction as well as cornerstone tasks embedded in the CUPs.

**Person Responsible** Alexandria Lovegrove (alexandria.lovegrove@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.**

Science education has been to cultivate students' scientific habits of mind, develop their capability to engage in scientific inquiry and teach students how to reason in a scientific context. Science allows students to explore their world and discover new things. It is also an active subject, containing activities such as hands-on labs and experiments. This makes Science well-suited to active younger children. Science is an important part of the foundation for education for all children.

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

In 2021-22 science achievement was 52%. In 2022-23 student achievement will increase by 4%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through district pre-tests, midyear, and posttests as well as NWEA data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kara Crisp (kara.crisp@osceolaschools.net)

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

The Science curriculum must be made relevant to students by framing lessons in contexts that give facts, teach concepts that matter in students' lives, and provide opportunities for solving complex problems.

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

Students who manipulate scientific ideas using hands-on/minds-on strategies and activities are more successful than peers who are taught by teachers relying primarily on lecture and the textbook (Lynch & Zenchak, 2002).

**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/Professional Learning Communities - Admin over Science will attend grade level PLCs and help with data desegregation, backward planning, common assessments and guidance on curriculum.

**Person Responsible** Kara Crisp (kara.crisp@osceolaschools.net)

Differentiation - Utilize PENDA to differentiate.

**Person Responsible** Kara Crisp (kara.crisp@osceolaschools.net)

Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning - Admin will conduct walkthroughs with NEST tool to determine needs for professional development and follow up with classroom walkthroughs to monitor implementation.

**Person Responsible** Kara Crisp (kara.crisp@osceolaschools.net)

Standards Aligned Instruction - PDs given on CUPs to ensure standards aligned instruction.

**Person Responsible** Kara Crisp (kara.crisp@osceolaschools.net)

Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices (Rigor, Expectations, Engagement) - WICOR strategies used in instruction as well as cornerstone tasks embedded in the CUPs.

**Person Responsible** Kara Crisp (kara.crisp@osceolaschools.net)

## RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

### Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

### Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

**Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

N/A

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

N/A

**Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

N/A

**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.**

The school engage families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction and hold staff responsible for implementing any changes. We frequently communicate high expectations for all students (e.g., "All students are college material"). Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example:

- Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in disaggregated data
  - Student work is displayed throughout school
  - All students are enrolled in college and career ready prep curriculum
- A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created. Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, in an

out-of-school suspension, and attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for particular groups within a school and what needs to be done. Such as, establishing specific strategies, but attainable for reducing disproportionate discipline with staff, student, and family input. Implementing evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and provide ongoing training and feedback to teachers on implementing these approaches. The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on school-wide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. They also structure the master schedule to include collaborative planning and ensure it is rooted in data on student progress and interests. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. The schools, curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students. The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making through SAC council. It reaches out to families and the community early and often - not just when there is an issue. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students and follow up with what's being done as a result. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation, and provide food and childcare). It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically under-served students (e.g., by providing opportunities for small-group conversations with school leaders). Finally, the school provides all teachers with training on social and emotional skills.

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

Thomas Rademacher - Principal  
 Kara Crisp - Assistant Principal  
 Frankie Franceschi - Assistant Principal  
 Teresia Augustine - Dean  
 Conrad Forbes - Dean  
 Monica Forty-Way - PBIS  
 Adrianna Zuniga - Guidance  
 Sylmari Mendez - Guidance  
 Kacie Rosario - RCS  
 Lourdes Alvarez - ECS  
 Judith Genao - Interventionist  
 Shaniqua Wilkerson - Social Worker  
 Cynthia Franklin - School Psychologist