

Marion County Public Schools

Osceola Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Osceola Middle School

526 SE TUSCAWILLA AVE, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Osceola, we strive to provide a school environment where differentiated instruction is provided to meet the needs of every student to the best of our ability. We will aim to provide an educational program that is academically challenging; our educational program engages each student by linking curricular content to previous knowledge and experience while remaining exciting enough to promote further exploration of new ideas. We will maximize our use of resources through collaborative partnerships with our community, our business, and education partners. Osceola students will be prepared to pursue excellence for tomorrow's challenges.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Osceola Middle School, working with families and the community, will engage all learners in high quality, rigorous, relevant, and standards-based instruction in a safe, inclusive environment.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Koff, Matthew	Principal	The Principal designs and implements a professional development plan which focuses on maximizing the use of strategies to foster standards-based instruction. The Principal ensures that members of the school-based leadership team are all actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process. The principal actively discusses student data from Tier 1 progress monitoring tools with teachers in order to track the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction.
Collins, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal of Curriculum (APC) is responsible for curriculum-related matters and overseeing the guidance department. The APC works alongside the principal to teach and support the teachers as they work through implementing the best strategies possible in the classrooms. The APC is a consistent presence in the classroom by offering support and nonjudgmental feedback. The members of the school-based leadership team are all actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process. The assistant principals frequently meet with the school psychologist, social worker, school counselor, and specific teachers at problem-solving meetings to re-visit data from students struggling at each Tier of instruction. Resources and interventions are assigned and monitored at the PST meetings. Appropriate direct instruction and computer software are utilized for both remediation and enrichment. Parents are notified of progress through progress reports, email, and parent conferences.
Cannon, John	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal of Discipline (APD) is responsible for overseeing the Student Service Department and facilities. The APD works alongside the principal to teach and support the teachers as they work through implementing the best strategies possible in the classrooms. The APD is a consistent presence in the classroom by offering support and nonjudgmental feedback. The members of the school-based leadership team are all actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process. The assistant principals frequently meet with the school psychologist, social worker, school counselor, and specific teachers at problem-solving meetings to re-visit data from students struggling at each Tier of instruction. Resources and interventions are assigned and monitored at the PST meetings. Appropriate direct instruction and computer software are utilized for both remediation and enrichment. Parents are notified of progress through progress reports, email, and parent conferences.
Lorick, Amanda	School Counselor	School Counselors develop and carry out programs based on the developmental needs of students, needs assessments, and school, district, and state priorities. Counselors communicated the goals and services of the counseling programs to school administration, staff, students, and parents. School Counselors provide personal/growth counseling, including individual and/or group, to promote academic success. School counselors are members of the school-based leadership team and are actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Schooley, Morgen	School Counselor	School Counselors develop and carry out programs based on the developmental needs of students, needs assessments, and school, district, and state priorities. Counselors communicated the goals and services of the counseling programs to school administration, staff, students, and parents. School Counselors provide personal/growth counseling, including individual and/or group, to promote academic success. School counselors are members of the school-based leadership team and are actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process.
Sapp, Michelle	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of Professional Development of literacy strategies in all classrooms. She also assists in data analysis, including DPMAs and other progress monitoring data. The Instructional Coach also works as an active member of the multidisciplinary team.
Nelson, Crystal	Dean	Student Service Managers (SSM) assist in the development of guidelines for proper student conduct and disciplinary policies and procedures that ensure a safe and orderly environment. They maintain comprehensive files on each student requiring disciplinary action and maintain these records for audits. SSM reviews and analyze data to implement strategies with parents, students, and teachers to facilitate student behavior change. Student Service Managers are members of the school-based leadership team and are actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process.
Smith, Denise	Dean	Student Service Managers (SSM) assist in the development of guidelines for proper student conduct and disciplinary policies and procedures that ensure a safe and orderly environment. They maintain comprehensive files on each student requiring disciplinary action and maintain these records for audits. SSM reviews and analyze data to implement strategies with parents, students, and teachers to facilitate student behavior change. Student Service Managers are members of the school-based leadership team and are actively involved in the MTSS and MDT process.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The leadership team reviews and analyzes the data to identify the areas of strength and growth for Osceola Middle School. The data used is from statewide assessments, student discipline, student attendance, parent survey, student survey, and a staff survey. This data is presented to the School advisory team for additional input.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Weekly Leadership Meeting will review SIP goals and present any present any current data to progress monitor SIP goals. In addition, School Advisory council meetings the Principal or designee will present the current data and seek input from the SAC committee. SAC feedback will be presented to the Leadership team following the SAC meetings. Data will drill down to our underperforming students; including Students with disabilities and our African American subgroups. The Action steps for achieving the SIP goal will be revised if the data shows progress not being made toward achieving the desired outcomes of the goal.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	43%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	71%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	80	75	219	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	79	62	190	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	60	68	167	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	86	47	174	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	97	64	228	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	89	48	216	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	88	72	212

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	80	75	219	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	79	62	190	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	60	68	167	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	86	47	174	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	97	64	228	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	89	48	216	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	88	72	212

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	80	75	219	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	79	62	190	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	60	68	167	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	86	47	174	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	97	64	228	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	89	48	216	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	88	72	212

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	50			55	42	50	59		
ELA Learning Gains				48	41	48	55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34	31	38	39		
Math Achievement*	69			61	46	54	60		
Math Learning Gains				59	49	58	50		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44	43	55	38		
Science Achievement*	52			60	40	49	57		
Social Studies Achievement*	72			71	65	71	73		
Middle School Acceleration	66			70			76		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	56			58			52		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	365
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	560
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	4	2
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	40	Yes	2	
HSP	50			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	46			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	3	1
ELL	33	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	45			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	41			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	50			69			52	72	66			56
SWD	22			33			22	47			4	
ELL	29			45			36	56			5	56
AMI												
ASN	68			95			64		83		4	
BLK	34			47			25	63	31		5	
HSP	37			53			33	64	57		6	56
MUL	59			78			50	75	80		5	
PAC												
WHT	57			78			63	76	68		5	
FRL	33			50			31	59	46		6	55

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	55	48	34	61	59	44	60	71	70			58
SWD	15	29	25	24	34	27	16	53				
ELL	20	33	33	43	41	23	11	36				58
AMI												
ASN	69	59		83	69		83	90	86			
BLK	30	33	32	32	45	50	29	50	40			
HSP	39	42	30	51	55	36	36	57	46			56
MUL	61	44	27	53	45	25	60	64	69			
PAC												
WHT	65	53	38	71	64	44	72	79	73			
FRL	36	39	34	42	47	34	41	53	38			50

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	59	55	39	60	50	38	57	73	76			52
SWD	16	32	32	23	39	35	16	38				
ELL	14	47	48	25	50	46	8	26				52
AMI												
ASN	79	72		75	52			91	86			
BLK	28	38	30	23	27	22	13	36				
HSP	40	50	46	41	46	39	40	56	46			57
MUL	55	53		55	49		64	79				
PAC												
WHT	69	59	40	73	56	47	68	86	82			
FRL	37	46	39	38	44	34	32	53	42			58

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	44%	37%	7%	47%	-3%
08	2023 - Spring	47%	38%	9%	47%	0%
06	2023 - Spring	51%	36%	15%	47%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	69%	44%	25%	54%	15%
07	2023 - Spring	70%	41%	29%	48%	22%
08	2023 - Spring	58%	45%	13%	55%	3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	51%	37%	14%	44%	7%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	44%	55%	50%	49%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	43%	57%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	58%	12%	66%	4%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Osceola Middle School student proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA) was 48% . Student were administered a new statewide assessment this past year, therefore data could not be compared with certainty from previous year data. OMS continued to decline in the area of ELA.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Science Data showed a 8% decline from 60% to 52% from the previous year. This data correlated with the proficiency reported with our ELA data.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

All tested categories exceeded the state average in percentages. Students with Disabilities, ELL, and African American subgroups in 2022 data fell below the federal index of 41%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Mathematics data showed that 73% of students demonstrated proficiency on the new FAST Mathematics Statewide Assessment.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

23% of OMS students missed more the 10% of school days during the 2021-2022 school year.
24% of OMS students scored a level 1 on the FSA ELA Statewide Assessment.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

ELA Proficiency
ELA Learning gains
Students with Disabilities learning gains
ELL Students learning gains
African American students learning gains.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Through data analysis and classroom-focused visits, we realized that standards and student work weren't always aligned. The vision of quality instruction at OMS includes knowing our standards and teaching them to the depth they will be assessed. By continuing a backward design for lesson planning, teachers will develop strategies and tasks that align to the depth of the standard. Students struggle with stamina with reading multiple texts on standardized assessments

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA Proficiency will increase from 48% to 52%

Monitoring:

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Sapp (michelle.sapp@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Collaboration practices and strategies will be focused on planning for student engagement while meeting the rigors of our state standards. During planning, teachers will seek multiple examples of paired text to include both fiction and information text including fiction and nonfiction excerpts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Working with paired text will build student stamina for Statewide assessments in ELA.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Combine ELA and Reading Instructional staff into one department,
2. Use both vertical and horizontal teaming approach during collaboration.

Person Responsible: Michelle Sapp (michelle.sapp@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023- April 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Osceola Middle currently has 3 identified underperforming subgroups that do not meet the 41% threshold as identified on our school report card. These subgroups include Students with Disabilities, ELL, and African American subgroups. Osceola Middle School is currently a ATSI (Additional Targeted Support and Improvement) school. By analyzing the early warning indicators of our underperforming students and using a problem-solving process, we can drill down to the root cause reason for their struggle in academic achievement. Once the root cause(s) are identified, then specific interventions can be implemented to raise achievement levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

African American subgroups will increase from 38% to 41% on the Federal Index.

ELL learners will increase from 33% to 38% on the Federal Index.

Students with Disabilities will increase from 28% to 33% on the Federal Index.

Monitoring:

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students with Disabilities and ELL students will have their individualized plans reviewed throughout the school year. Appropriate scheduling for SWD and ELL students will be coordinated by our Assistant Principal for Curriculum to provide an appropriate level of support. A new Mentoring program will help with give additional support to our students in these subgroups. Students will also have access to utilize Snap and Read program to help with Reading.

Our African American Subgroup will be provided with needed interventions in Math and/or ELA based on their individual needs.

Pending available funding opportunities, after-school tutorial will be utilized for our underperforming subgroups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Identifying underperforming students in our underperforming subgroups and their Early Warning Indicators.
2. Establishing a tutorial on using Snap and Read Program
3. Implementing a Mentoring program.
4. Invite students for after-school tutorial (pending the availability of funds)

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

By When: August 3, 2023, Identifying early warning indicators on specific students. September 30, 2023 - Implementation of mentoring program. October 1, 2023 - April 30, 2023 - After School Tutorial

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

ESSER funding will be used for an additional student services manager and for an instructional coach. District funds a mentor health counselor on our campus 2 and half days per week. Snap and Read computer software will be added to all student chrome books. IXL Supplemental resource will be available for all students.