School District of Osceola County, FL

St. Cloud Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

St. Cloud Middle School

1975 S MICHIGAN AVE, St Cloud, FL 34769

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Christina Harrell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2020

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)	65%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (59%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (61%)
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

St. Cloud Middle School

1975 S MICHIGAN AVE, St Cloud, FL 34769

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	65%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

School Grades History

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

Student Achievement is our #1 Priority.

Provide the school's vision statement.

St. Cloud Middle School strives to be a collaborative group of learners with student achievement being our #1 priority.

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
Harrell, Christina	Principal	In charge of financial, curricular, and instructional resources and decisions.
Burda, Nicole	Assistant Principal	In charge of curricular and instructional decisions.
Rousch, Amy	Assistant Principal	In charge of curricular and instructional decisions.
Fontaine, Kevin	Instructional Coach	Provides curricular intervention and provides progress monitoring data for district and state assessment.
Leonard, Sherry		Provides curricular intervention and provides progress monitoring data for district and state assessment.
Hoffman, Nicole	School Counselor	8th Grade Guidance Counselor, 504 & FIT Coordinator-provides focused support of students.
Metz, Dylan	School Counselor	7th Grade Guidance Counselor, 504 & FIT Coordinator-provides focused support of students.
Barley, Carrie		Overseeing implementation of student IEPs, 504s, and compliance
Alvarez Rios, Lourdes	ELL Compliance Specialist	Assists in the coordination of eligibility and placement of ELLs, ensures an efficient system of staffing for all ELL students, supports teachers with instructional strategies for students.
Stevens, Troy	Dean	Provides 6th-8th grade level discipline and EWS data.
Cameron, Morghan	Other	Provides mentoring to new teachers.
Wybiral, Juanita	Other	Provides mentoring to new teachers.
Zaidi, Misha	Reading Coach	Provides curricular intervention and provides progress monitoring data for district and state assessment.
Juste, Mernise	School Counselor	6th Grade Guidance Counselor, 504 & FIT Coordinator -provides focused support of students.
Stanley, Christine	Dean	Provides 6th-8th grade level discipline and EWS data.
Reynolds, Heather	Teacher, K-12	8th grade science teachers- responsible for science stocktake.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/13/2020, Christina Harrell

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.*
7

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.*
42

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
80

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,211

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
10

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	345	414	429	0	0	0	0	1188
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	17	12	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	95	117	0	0	0	0	302
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	81	96	0	0	0	0	301
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	95	117	0	0	0	0	302

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	4	7	14	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/16/2022

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	351	420	439	0	0	0	0	1210
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	69	92	0	0	0	0	222
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	35	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	5	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	102	122	0	0	0	0	318
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	188	124	0	0	0	0	431
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	52	58	0	0	0	0	143

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	351	420	439	0	0	0	0	1210
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	69	92	0	0	0	0	222
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	35	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	5	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	102	122	0	0	0	0	318
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	188	124	0	0	0	0	431
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	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	33	52	58	0	0	0	0	143

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	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	7

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	48%	44%	50%				55%	45%	54%

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	46%						52%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						41%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	55%	35%	36%				63%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains	60%						57%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						55%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	44%	53%				62%	47%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	54%	58%				80%	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	54%	48%	6%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	49%	47%	2%	52%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2022					
	2019	57%	49%	8%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	54%	45%	9%	55%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	22%	30%	-8%	54%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2022					
	2019	63%	47%	16%	46%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	56%	42%	14%	48%	8%
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	96%	44%	52%	57%	39%

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	21	35	32	28	50	49	24	42			
ELL	28	36	38	33	52	53	35	57	75		
ASN	67	73		79	71						

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
BLK	38	53	54	51	59	58	50	74			
HSP	43	43	37	47	60	59	52	73	77		
MUL	45	47		58	59	62	67	95			
WHT	57	49	42	66	61	67	73	87	87		
FRL	40	42	39	46	60	62	53	74	78		

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	43	34	29	43	38	41	51			
ELL	25	43	46	28	40	47	34	52			
ASN	63	75		74	69		80				
BLK	40	44	32	40	33	35	45	59	73		
HSP	44	48	37	44	44	38	55	73	66		
MUL	49	39		53	44		47	56			
WHT	60	52	40	63	51	57	74	84	87		
FRL	43	45	35	43	40	38	55	71	66		

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	21	39	34	33	49	40	22	43	75		
ELL	36	45	40	43	56	47	28	61	59		
ASN	72	56		72	72						
BLK	52	49	57	57	53	37	43	83	88		
HSP	48	50	42	56	56	54	53	77	88		
MUL	51	45	20	59	46	55	76	83	80		
WHT	61	54	41	70	58	58	69	82	89		
FRL	46	49	42	56	53	49	48	74	80		

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	59
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	591
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	73
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	55
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	55
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	62
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	
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	65
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	54
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?

Historically, over the past several years, ELA data has declined in both achievement and learning gains. In 2019, ELA achievement was 55% and declined to 48% in 2022. ELA learning gains data decreased from 52% in 2019 to 46% in 2022. While math data decreased in achievement, learning gains from 2019 to to 2021, there was a significant increase in both learning gains and lowest quartile from 2021 to 2022. Math learning gains data revealed a 13% increase from 47% to 60%, while lowest quartile data revealed a 16% increase from 44% to 60% from 2021-2022. Over the past three years, science and social studies data has remained consistent, only fluctuating slightly, but significantly outperforming the district and state achievement levels. 2021-2022 ESSA subgroup data revealed a trend in SWD data, aligning to the decrease in ELA achievement and lowest quartile and increase in math learning gains and lowest quartile. 2021-2022 ELL subgroup data revealed an increase in almost all categories except ELA learning gains and lowest quartile. Further trends revealed an overall increase in ESSA subgroups from 2021-2022, with significant improvement in math learning gains and lowest quartile. Acceleration data revealed that ESSA subgroup categories either maintained or increased achievement from 2021-2022.

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

ELA achievement data revealed a decline from 51% to 48%, while ELA learning gains data revealed a decline from 49% to 46% from 2021-2022. Our students with disabilities data also revealed a decrease in several categories from 2021-2022. SWD data revealed a 7% decrease in ELA achievement, from 28% to 21%, an 8% decrease in ELA learning gains, from 43% to 35%, a significant 17% decrease in science achievement, from 41% to 24%, and a 9% decrease in Social Studies achievement, from 51% to 42%.

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

During the 2021-2022 school year, the new ELA benchmarks were pushed out, however, some benchmarks were not tested on the FSA. Also, some FSA standards were not included in the new benchmarks. A contributing factor to ELA scores may have been the lack of focus on FSA tested standards, due to the push-out of the new benchmarks. This year, the new benchmarks with be tested, so the fact that they were implemented last year may benefit our ELA achievement scores this year. To address the need for improvement in our SWD population, we have implemented a push-out model for some students to provide support with in the general education classroom. Furthermore, in some of our self-contained classes, we have certified teachers live-streaming their lessons to help support instruction.

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

Math data in learning gains and lowest quartile revealed the greatest improvement increasing 13% from 47% to 60% in learning gains and 16% from 44% to 60% in lowest quartile.

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

Contributing factors to the improvement in math achievement, learning gains, and lowest quartile include a strong and cohesive PLC unit. Consistent evidence of common planning, which includes common assessments, homework, and bell work. New actions that contributed to improvement in data is the introduction of the Osceola Numeracy Project. The Osceola Numeracy Project implemented stations and use of hands on lesson three times a week. The program was held with high fidelity. The new implementation of Hands2Mind manipulatives in lessons was also a contributing factor.

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

We plan to incorporate AVID and WICOR strategies into lessons, as well as Kagan strategies. Ensuring that all teachers are following curriculum unit plans and utilizing district approved resources. There is a strong emphasis on PLC's for the 2022-2023 school year as well, which will help with teacher planning of instructional lessons and commonality across grade levels. We have also established two mentor teachers for this school year to help support new teachers.

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.

Mentor teachers will be meeting with new teachers to help implement CUPS and district resources. Mentors will provide coaching and modeling of instructional strategies. Many teachers were provided Kagan training over the summer and will be implementing these strategies this school year. Furthermore, coaches and mentors will provide professional development opportunities on instructional strategies as needed throughout the year.

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

If funding allows, providing more teachers with Kagan training opportunities will help to implement collaborative structures in the classroom.

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 Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Given the 2021 -2022 school data finding that only 40% of students were proficient in math, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of mathematic achievement for all students. Increased implementation of classroom collaborative structures and "Talk Moves" will also help improve this figure.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Math proficiency and learning gains will increase by 5% .Math achievement will increase from a 55 to 60 and math learning gains will increase from 60 to 65.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Administration, leadership team, department chair, 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. PLT's will take advantage of an extra paid hour of PLT each week.
	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.
	School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the PLC administrator and PLC facilitator will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Fontaine (kevin.fontaine@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Procedural fluency is the ability of students to apply procedures accurately, efficiently, and flexibly. Daily implementation of Mathematical Thinking & Reasoning Standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Procedural fluency is more than memorizing facts or procedures, and it is more than understanding and being able to use one procedure for a given situation. Procedural fluency builds on a foundation of conceptual understanding, strategic reasoning, and problem-solving (NGA Center & CCSSO, 2010; NCTM, 2000, 2014). All students need to have a deep and flexible knowledge of a variety of procedures, along with an ability to make critical judgments about which procedures or strategies are appropriate for use, in particular, situations (NRC, 2001, 2005, 2012; Star, 2005). Procedural fluency extends students' computational fluency and applies to all strands of mathematics.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers will intentionally plan for the appropriate stages of fluency as required by the benchmarks for a unit of study.

Person Responsible	Kevin Fontaine (kevin.fontaine@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.

Person Responsible	Kevin Fontaine (kevin.fontaine@osceolaschools.net)

The math coach will co-plan and model content previews with manipulatives with fluency as a focus.

Person Responsible	Kevin Fontaine (kevin.fontaine@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will provide opportunities for students to work collaboratively to share their strategies and refine their
thinking of fluency benchmarks by utilizing placemat consensus (Collaboration; MTR 4).

Person Responsible	Kevin Fontaine (kevin.fontaine@osceolaschools.net)

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, and Hand2Mind, and Pride Intervention.

Person Responsible	Kevin Fontaine (kevin.fontaine@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	By providing all students with grade-level, rigorous levels of civics instruction we can ensure that students receive the support and guidance necessary to be successful on all end of year assessments.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	We would like our Civics proficiency to increase by 3% from 79% to 82% on the Civics EOC.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Administrative Walk-Throughs, monitoring the Civics PLC, district quarterly assessments, common unit assessments, PRIDE group designations as needed
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Morghan Cameron (morghan.cameron@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	A PLC is "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. Professional learning communities operate under the assumption that the key to improved learning for students is continuous job-embedded learning for educators." (Solution Tree). PLC's have long been implemented in Osceola County. Their impact on student achievement - when they are effective - is well noted.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	PLC is a strength for our Civics Department. We believe that with continuous collaborative effort this PLC will have a more profound impact on student achievement.

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

Ensure teachers deliver daily content-specific knowledge and experience in the classroom by using standardized lessons and differentiated instruction for ELL and ESE students.

Person Responsible   Morghan Cameron (morghan.cameron@osceolaschools.net)

Ensure professional learning communities are meeting to progress monitor and track student progress.

Person Responsible   Morghan Cameron (morghan.cameron@osceolaschools.net)

Ensure all students are being supported in Social Studies in Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3.

Person Responsible   Morghan Cameron (morghan.cameron@osceolaschools.net)

Administer Fall, Winter, and Spring district progress monitoring assessments, and adjust intervention period as needed.

Person Responsible   Morghan Cameron (morghan.cameron@osceolaschools.net)

#3. 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 that the 2021-2022 FSA ELA school data, 48% of SCMS's students performed proficiently, an area of focus for this school year would be to dive into making meaning of data to drive instruction.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Our goal is to increase 7% of student proficiency on the FSA ELA across grade levels.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Administration, leadership, and the literacy coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure that teachers are effectively using their time to utilize data to drive instruction and support students' needs and academic achievements.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Misha Zaidi (mishazaidi@gmail.com)
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 their teachers decision-making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great impact 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 there is 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 assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning (Marzano, 2003; William, 2007). Some strategies would include: Collaborative Strategies: PLCs, ELA PDs, and coaching cycles Avid Strategies: Think, Pair, Share; Stand Share Sit; Rally Robin; 4 Corners; Quiz, Quiz, Trade; Sage-N-Scribe; Placemat Consensus; Showdown

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.

All staff will be trained by the literacy and teacher mentor coach in best practice strategies for utilizing data to implement quality instruction to improve student achievement scores on the ELA FSA for the 2022-2023 school year.

Person Responsible   Misha Zaidi (mishazaidi@gmail.com)

Weekly PLT check-ins with teachers on how student achievement data (through summative assessments, BeAble, Achieve, Study Sync, etc.) is being incorporated into classrooms. Teachers will bring weekly data with them to walk through and model how to utilize data within standards-based lessons (through BeAble, Achieve, Study Sync, etc.)

Person Responsible   Misha Zaidi (mishazaidi@gmail.com)

Providing mentoring and supplemental training for new teachers on how to utilize data within the classroom for data-driven instruction

Person Responsible   Misha Zaidi (mishazaidi@gmail.com)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to school community members

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Programs that build relationships among stakeholders have proven to impact student achievement and social emotional well-being.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	2021-2022 Panorama results revealed that 34% of students felt a sense of belonging we will increase that by 7%. 2021-2022 Panorama results revealed that 49% felt safe at school, we will increase that by 6%. 2021-2022 insight survey results revealed that 86% of teachers felt leaders promoted a safe school environment, we will increase that by 4%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	-Panorama survey in fall and spring -Insight survey -PBIS attendance and behavior data for ESSA subgroups -Monthly stocktake -MTSS weekly meetings
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Hoffman (nicole.hoffman@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Kagan strategies such as Rally Robin and Timed Pair Share.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the	Gavin Clowes, a Kagan trainer, states that "Teachers that use just Rally Robin and Timed Pair Share can make a huge difference in achievement and engagement and can take their students a very long way simply instead of "calling-on-one." Along with higher academic achievement you will also see a reduction of the gap between high and low achieving students, improved social skills and cooperativeness, improved self-esteem,

rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	increased liking for school and learning, improved classroom climate, decreased discipline problems, increased leadership and employability skills, improved conflict resolution skills and increased empathy and concern for others!"

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.

-Kagan strategies implemented into classrooms
-PD on Kagan structures
- Giving students voice of equity
-PBIS training
-PBIS implementation
-SEL lessons
-small groups
-Tier 2 behavior groups
-Mentoring program
-targeting student interests
-Promote student involvement

Person Responsible	Nicole Hoffman (nicole.hoffman@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.	By providing all students with grade-level, rigorous levels of science instruction we can ensure that students receive the support and guidance necessary to be successful on all end of year assessments.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Science proficiency will increase by 5%. It will increase from 62% to 67%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	1. Administration, leadership team, coaches, and teachers (self-monitor) will work together to monitor instruction as well as work in PLCs to plan for instruction. 2. Formative and summative 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:	Heather Reynolds (heather.reynolds@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	• Participate in academic discourse through collaborative structures • Engage in active learning experiences • Process learning using interactive science notebooks
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	According to www.avid.org, "Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) is an in-school academic support program for grades seven through twelve. The purpose of the program is to prepare students for college eligibility and success." In AVID, WICOR strategies provide a learning model for educators to use to guide students in comprehending concepts and articulating ideas at complex levels. When students talk with each other, their understanding, and questions they have, they not only process new knowledge verbally, but also engage in the topic and are empowered to express their own thoughts (AVID). 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 relevant to their lives. WICOR (AVID)

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. (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.

1. Identify team members who will lead the needs assessment, planning, learning, and monitoring of science instructional practices.

Person Responsible   Heather Reynolds (heather.reynolds@osceolaschools.net)

2. Develop a common understanding among team members for each instructional strategy and expectations for what each looks like in the classroom.
a. Can focus on one strategy at a time, identifying priorities.
b. Revisit understanding and expectations of strategy monthly, sharing examples and non-examples.
c. Highlight good examples and incorporate into professional learning.

Person Responsible   Heather Reynolds (heather.reynolds@osceolaschools.net)

3. Conduct classroom walk-throughs, focusing on highest priority science instructional strategy. Walk-through should be focused on student learning (not teacher facilitating). What are students doing? Can students describe what they are learning and why they are learning it?

Person Responsible   Heather Reynolds (heather.reynolds@osceolaschools.net)

4. Use data (formative assessments and progress monitoring) to discuss student learning gains and plan for professional learning and coaching needs.

Person Responsible   Heather Reynolds (heather.reynolds@osceolaschools.net)

5. Work with school- and district-based science team to develop professional learning that address areas of need specific to science instructional practice and strategies.

Person Responsible   Heather Reynolds (heather.reynolds@osceolaschools.net)

6. Identify and schedule dates for continuous cycle of learning which includes developing understanding of strategy, monitoring in instructional practice, needs assessment discussion, professional learning to address needs, implementation post professional learning through monitoring.

Person Responsible   Heather Reynolds (heather.reynolds@osceolaschools.net)

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

Person Responsible   Heather Reynolds (heather.reynolds@osceolaschools.net)

8. Teachers will learn and implement standards-based stations and implement differentiated instruction as an instructional strategy to breakdown student data and content mastery.

Person Responsible   Heather Reynolds (heather.reynolds@osceolaschools.net)

#6. 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.	Teachers who participate in authentic PLCs in all accountability areas can collaborate and prepare engaging strategies, best practices, and common assessments to monitor for student achievement.
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% from 48% to 55% -Math proficiency will increase by 5% from 55% to 60% -Science proficiency will increase by 5% from 62% to 67% -Civics proficiency will increase by 3% 79% to 82% -Acceleration proficiency will increase by 8% from 82% to 90%
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	-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. -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. -School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the PLC administrator and PLC facilitator will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christina Harrell (christina.harrell@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	A professional learning community (PLC) is defined as "…an ongoing process in which educators work collaboratively in recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action research to achieve better results for the students they serve" (DuFour, 2006).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The PLC model is based on building teachers' competencies that will help lead to improved academic, behavioral, and/or social outcomes for students. By PLCs setting clear objectives that are focused on student learning and outcomes, PLCs can plan for achievement. Completing the seven stages models ensures that PLCs are progressing toward a collaborative team that can provide evidence of student achievement through data disaggregation, planning, and revising as needed.

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.

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   Amy Rousch (amy.rousch@osceolaschools.net)

Schools PLC's teams will meet four times a month during designated times that are dedicated to PLC time focused on working together as a team for student success purposes.

Person Responsible   Amy Rousch (amy.rousch@osceolaschools.net)

Collaborative professional development will be conducted throughout the year to build shared knowledge of PLC processes through the PLC facilitator and PLC administrator.

Person Responsible   Amy Rousch (amy.rousch@osceolaschools.net)

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   Amy Rousch (amy.rousch@osceolaschools.net)

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 Rousch (amy.rousch@osceolaschools.net)

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

Person Responsible   Kevin Fontaine (kevin.fontaine@osceolaschools.net)

Each grade level or content area team will have an embedded PLC lead to monitor their team and report to PLC facilitator as needed.

Person Responsible   Kevin Fontaine (kevin.fontaine@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   Kevin Fontaine (kevin.fontaine@osceolaschools.net)

Each PLC will complete the seven stages rubric at the BOY, MOY, and EOY

Person Responsible   Kevin Fontaine (kevin.fontaine@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. §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.

Research suggests that a strong sense of community is important to maintaining a positive educational environment, optimizing engagement, and keeping anxiety levels low, all learning factors that have been shown to enhance student achievement. We are a PBIS school, and we strive to implement and model those
strategies every day at SCMS. Monthly PRIDE lessons will be taught by teachers focusing on key character traits like respect and integrity. Counselors will continue to be available for students in crisis, and there will be MTSS social/emotional groups for our T2 and T3 discipline/disruption students. Teaching inclusion and multicultural awareness will also be stressed throughout the school year.

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

All faculty and staff members at SCMS are stakeholders in promoting a positive school culture and environment.
This is done through building relationships with students, providing "red carpet" customer service to parents and community members. As a Title I school, we will hold multiple events throughout the year to encourage participation among our school community to build upon and foster positive relationships together.