

School District of Osceola County, FL

Narcoossee 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Narcoossee Middle School

2700 N NARCOOSSEE RD, Saint Cloud, FL 34771

www.osceolaschools.net

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Osceola County School Board on 10/10/2023.

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.

The Narcoossee Middle School Community will empower stakeholders to relentlessly pursue success through collaboration, a growth mindset, and a safe environment. Our learners will be entrusted with the skills necessary to excel as future ready graduates.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Everything we do is solely for the students; we believe we can teach all students and that all students will learn given the appropriate resources.

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
Rivera, Francisco	Principal	
Schneider, Lucile	Assistant Principal	
Smalling, Marisha	Instructional Coach	
Tandlich, Gabrielle	Math Coach	
Hopkins, Jamie	Assistant Principal	
Swanson, Peter	Other	
Hodge, Margaret	Other	
Powell, Shaunacy	Teacher, K-12	
Martinez, Gloriane	School Counselor	

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.

Teachers were surveyed at the end on last school year to provide feedback of PLCs, WIN time, and any other areas of concern. Student input is solicited through the Panorama survey. This year we will add a PBIS survey. Additionally, the PTO sent out a survey to parents and families requesting feedback and the end of the year. Once this information was gathered, it was addressed through the goals and plans of the SIP.

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))

The SIP will be shared with all stakeholders. Monthly Stocktake meetings, weekly leadership meetings that analyze walkthrough trends, and analysis of common assessment data will be used to monitor the implementation of the SIP. During monthly Stocktake meetings, action items will be added to address any shortcoming within an area of focus. A professional development plan will be developed, and items will be added and changed as information shows trends from the progress monitoring data and walkthrough information identifies needs.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	80%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	52%
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: A
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	54	75	107	236
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	64	37	121
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	18	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	19
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	95	127	303
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	120	112	335
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	32	55	57	144

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

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	0	10	10	20
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	9	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	77	67	207
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	89	88	279
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	27	12	65

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	7	40	39	86

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

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	0	10	10	20	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	12	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	9	21	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	77	67	207	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	89	88	279	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	27	12	65	

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	7	40	39	86

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

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*	52	41	49	56	44	50	58		
ELA Learning Gains				49			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			38		
Math Achievement*	63	46	56	58	35	36	56		
Math Learning Gains				59			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			41		
Science Achievement*	55	47	49	61	44	53	56		
Social Studies Achievement*	77	64	68	83	54	58	77		
Middle School Acceleration	88	79	73	87	51	49	78		
Graduation Rate					49	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	51	41	40	34	81	76	32		

* 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	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	386
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	582
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	22	Yes	2	1
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	93			
BLK	68			
HSP	59			
MUL	87			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	56			

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	36	Yes	1	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	61			
HSP	55			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	50			

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	52			63			55	77	88			51
SWD	14			26			14	35			4	
ELL	38			53			38	61	86		6	51
AMI												
ASN	87			90			91	96	100		5	
BLK	58			63			47	85	89		5	
HSP	46			57			46	71	85		6	49
MUL	68			86			86	94	100		5	
PAC												
WHT	58			69			69	84	88		5	
FRL	42			53			41	67	88		6	43

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	56	49	35	58	59	60	61	83	87			34
SWD	13	31	30	21	45	48	20	52	71			27
ELL	38	43	35	45	56	61	45	64	76			34
AMI												
ASN	86	71		76	71		79		93			
BLK	55	49	44	56	66	72	56	67	88			
HSP	50	47	35	51	57	57	54	80	84			34
MUL	74	47		83	68		69	94	89			
PAC												
WHT	66	52	34	68	59	66	71	92	90			
FRL	43	40	28	44	55	58	48	71	77			33

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	58	54	38	56	48	41	56	77	78			32
SWD	18	33	30	23	37	32	14	35	53			15
ELL	33	45	37	35	40	36	23	52	58			32
AMI												
ASN	89	78		92	61		93	90	100			
BLK	54	56	38	51	43	32	48	63	62			
HSP	52	51	37	48	45	39	47	73	72			33
MUL	75	67		81	63							
PAC												
WHT	66	55	43	66	51	44	67	86	88			
FRL	43	46	34	41	40	36	37	68	72			33

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	48%	39%	9%	47%	1%
08	2023 - Spring	48%	40%	8%	47%	1%
06	2023 - Spring	49%	39%	10%	47%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	66%	40%	26%	54%	12%
07	2023 - Spring	47%	39%	8%	48%	-1%
08	2023 - Spring	57%	48%	9%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	45%	35%	10%	44%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	40%	52%	50%	42%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	36%	57%	48%	45%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	65%	29%	63%	31%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	76%	63%	13%	66%	10%

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.

ELA data shows a proficiency of 49%. This is the lowest performance area. The ELA data has declined for the past 4 years. The contributing factors are lingering COVID effects, teacher turn over, and less experienced teachers taking over in classes.

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

Science achievement declined the most. It fell from 61% to 47% proficient. The factors that contributed to this decline were teacher turn over. Teachers were also less experienced with the curriculum and formatively assessing students.

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.

After reviewing the state average and comparing it to our scores, we found that 7th grade math was the only subject area below the state average. The factor that contributed to this gap was the fact that we had two new 7th grade math teachers that were career changers.

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

Math achievement showed the most improvement. It increased from 58 to 66% proficiency. The new actions taken by the school were to use a CIM model for review of standards identified as the lowest performing from previous administered assessments.

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

The early warning system indicated a high number of students who scored a level 1 in ELA and Math. ELA was our lowest area last year and adds to the necessity to focus in this area.

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

1. ESE Subgroup performance
2. ELA Achievement
3. Science Achievement

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 Science**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.

Science achievement has declined to 45% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Science achievement proficiency will increase to 52%.

Monitoring:

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

Science proficiency will be measured through the NWEA Map Growth assessments given three times per year; classroom unit assessments given one to two times per month; and data collected weekly from classroom walkthrough visits.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shaunacy Powell (shaunacy.powell@osceolaschools.net)

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.)

The science PLC will be working closely utilizing the unit assessments, created by the school district resource team, to ensure they are both align to the standard and to use them for data-digging purposes in the PLC. They will use a CIM based model to provide intervention for students based on academic need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The research on collective teacher efficacy is strong, according to John Hattie ($d=1.57$). Using their collective efficacy and the CIM based model our teachers will be targeting the right interventions to improve student academic needs.

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.

Teachers will plan lessons utilizing questions designed to solicit complex tasks problem solving in alignment with the standards and CUPS.

Person Responsible: Lucile Schneider (lucile.schneider@osceolaschools.net)

By When: On going

Professional Development designed/provided to enhance ESE strategies specifically aligned to science tasks by District Science Teacher and District ESE Teacher or other professional.

Person Responsible: Gabrielle Tandlich (gabrielle.tandlich@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly, on going, beginning in October

PLCs will use common formative assessment to drive instruction and design lessons.

Person Responsible: Lucile Schneider (lucile.schneider@osceolaschools.net)

By When: On going, at the end of each unit

Walkthrough data will be utilized to tier teachers according to need. School based coaches and mentors will work to model lesson and provide support.

Person Responsible: Lucile Schneider (lucile.schneider@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Tiered teachers identified by September 29th. Coaching will be ongoing

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

The overall proficiency of the SWD subgroup was 36%. The ELA proficiency of the SWD subgroup has been declining for the past four years. This year has shown the greatest discrepancy in proficiency between overall ELA achievement (49%) and ELA achievement for SWD (12%). Additionally, the proficiency of SWD in both math and science are below the federal index of 40%. SWD proficiency in math was 21% and in science it was 20%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The overall proficiency of the SWD subgroup will increase to 42% or greater. The subject area proficiencies for SWD in ELA, math and science will increase to the minimum level of the federal index of 41%.

Monitoring:

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

Leadership team will monitor use of best practices ESE strategies through walkthrough data. ESE student progress will be monitored through FAST BEST progress monitoring data, unit assessments, NWEA, Star reading and Star math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Margaret Hodge (margaret.hodge@osceolaschools.net)

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.)

Use of manipulatives to improve student understanding of concepts within small group instruction for ESE students in Math. In reading, Achieve 3000 will be used in a combination of technology-based interventions along with teacher instruction for ELA. Designate Intervention time that allows for all subject areas to be utilized. Ongoing Professional development focused on ELA, Reading and Math and conjunction with ESE needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The study found significant positive effects for the combined sample of sixth graders (effect size =+0.22). This qualifies Achieve3000 for the ESSA "Strong" category. (What Works Clearinghouse, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. (2018, February). Adolescent Literacy intervention report: Achieve3000®. Retrieved from <https://whatworks.ed.gov>)

Effective interventions for improving the mathematics achievement of students with mathematics difficulties share one key feature: the design of the curricular materials and the instruction provided are systematic. (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/WWC2021006-Math-PG.pdf#page=12>)

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.

Professional development related to ESE accommodations within a mathematics classroom will be provided by a district resource specialist or math coach.

Person Responsible: Gabrielle Tandlich (gabrielle.tandlich@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September

Professional development related to ESE accommodations within an ELA classroom will be provided by a district resource specialist or literacy coach.

Person Responsible: Marisha Smalling (marisha.smalling@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September

Professional development related to ESE accommodations within a science classroom will be provided by a district resource specialist or mentor teacher.

Person Responsible: Shaunacy Powell (shaunacy.powell@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October

ESE student performance on formative assessments used in School City will be tracked each month.

Person Responsible: Margaret Hodge (margaret.hodge@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Starting September 20th, and each last Thursday of the month.

Provide professional development for support facilitation teachers to provide scaffolds while maintaining rigor and a balanced relationship between the classroom teacher and the support facilitation teacher.

Person Responsible: Margaret Hodge (margaret.hodge@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 11th

#3. 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.

For the past four years, the proficiency in ELA has declined. This year ELA proficiency is at 49%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA proficiency will increase to 55%.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through BEST progress monitoring assessments, ELA checks for understanding collected within School City, Achieve Lexile monthly growth, and weekly walkthrough data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marisha Smalling (marisha.smalling@osceolaschools.net)

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.)

As we evaluate student progress in ELA, students that are not making adequate progress will be provided with intervention based on their needs. This will take place through the MTSS process. Tier 2 students will be provided support through Achieve 3000. Tier 3 students will be provided small group instruction aligned with need utilizing programs approved by the state reading plan.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The study found significant positive effects for the combined sample of sixth graders (effect size =+0.22). This qualifies Achieve3000 for the ESSA "Strong" category.

What Works Clearinghouse, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. (2018, February).

Adolescent Literacy intervention report: Achieve3000®. Retrieved from <https://whatworks.ed.gov>

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.

Teachers will orient students to track personal data and set goals for achievement.

Person Responsible: Marisha Smalling (marisha.smalling@osceolaschools.net)

By When: ongoing, initial goal set after PM1.

Professional Development designed/provided to enhance ESE strategies specifically aligned to ELA tasks by Literacy Coach, District Science Teacher and District ESE Teacher or other professional.

Person Responsible: Marisha Smalling (marisha.smalling@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 30

ELA teachers will be tiered to identify support needed and provided by literacy coach and mentor teachers. Tier 1 teachers will receive walkthroughs monthly and feedback. Tier 2 teachers will receive walkthroughs twice a month with specific support from coaches at least two times per month. Tier 3 teachers will receive weekly walkthroughs with specific support from coaches on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible: Marisha Smalling (marisha.smalling@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Tiered teachers identified by September 15th.

Students identified as tier 2 or tier 3 will receive targeted intervention and monitored for progress.

Person Responsible: Peter Swanson (peter.swanson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Students in need identified by September 30. ELA interventions begin by October 16th.

#4. 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.

In looking at our early warning system data, there are three areas that are of concern: attendance, level 1 in ELA, and level 1 in Math. 17% of our students have less than 90% attendance from the previous school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students with less than 90% attendance will decrease from 17% to 13% or less.

Monitoring:

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

Attendance will be monitored monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Peter Swanson (peter.swanson@osceolaschools.net)

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.)

The school will use positive behavior intervention systems to encourage student attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

An evaluation by Faria et al. (2017) tested the impact of the Early Warning Intervention and Monitoring System (EWIMS) on 35,888 students in grades 9 and 10 after one year of implementation. Seventy-three high schools in three Midwestern states were randomly assigned to implement EWIMS or to continue their usual practices for identifying and supporting students at risk of not graduating on time. The percentage of students who were chronically absent was significantly lower in EWIMS schools (effect size = +0.23), qualifying EWIMS for ESSA's "Strong" category.

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.

PBIS monthly incentive calendar will be established.

Person Responsible: Gloriane Martinez (gloria.martinez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 15th

Each monthly PBIS activity will be advertised to students and parents.

Person Responsible: Gloriane Martinez (gloria.martinez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: By second Friday of each month

Students with more than 3 absences in one month will meet with guidance to develop attendance plan. Parents will be contacted and provided with attendance information.

Person Responsible: Gloriane Martinez (gloria.martinez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: By 7th day of each month

Attendance concern list will be developed and reviewed each month. Students on list will be given staff mentor for weekly check in.

Person Responsible: Peter Swanson (peter.swanson@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 20

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

15 new teachers here hired this school year. 18% of the current staff are new to NCMS.

Measurable Outcome:

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

85% of the current Narcoossee Middle School teachers will return for the 2024-2025 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Quarterly surveys created and sent out to staff during the last week of each quarter.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Francisco Rivera (francisco.riveramieles@osceolaschools.net)

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.)

Teachers will be supported through a new teacher mentor program, academic coaches, and monthly positive celebrations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Schedule of monthly celebrations created.

Person Responsible: Jamie Hopkins (jamie.hopkins@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 29th

Teachers will be tiered according to need for support from mentor teachers and academic coaches. Tier 3 teachers that require more support receive coaching on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible: Marisha Smalling (marisha.smalling@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 11

Teachers will be surveyed to identify what rewards they would like in the staff PBIS store.

Person Responsible: Gloriane Martinez (gloria.martinez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 29th

Staff PBIS incentives will be shared with teachers/staff and reward center opened.

Person Responsible: Gloriane Martinez (gloria.martinez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 20th

Quarterly teacher survey developed and set out to all teachers.

Person Responsible: Francisco Rivera (francisco.riveramieles@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 29th

Mentor schedule developed for new and new to Narcoossee teachers.

Person Responsible: Shaunacy Powell (shaunacy.powell@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 8th

Celebrate teachers with monthly Bear lamp (trophy) handed out at the first monthly faculty meeting and each month after that.

Person Responsible: Francisco Rivera (francisco.riveramieles@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 27th

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).

Yearly funds are allocated for a literacy coach. This coach works with all ELA and reading teachers to provide mentoring, support, and modeling in the classroom of best practices. This impacts all students to ensure educational needs are met.