

School District of Osceola County, FL

St. Cloud 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 | 29 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

St. Cloud Middle School

1975 S MICHIGAN AVE, St Cloud, FL 34769

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.

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, 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 |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|---|
| 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. |
| 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. |
| Barley, Carrie | Staffing Specialist | Overseeing implementation of student IEPs, 504s, and compliance |
| Cameron , Morghan | Other | Provides mentoring to new teachers. |
| Fontaine, Kevin | Math Coach | Provides curricular intervention and provides progress monitoring data for district and state assessment. Provides mentoring to new teachers. |
| Hoffman, Nicole | School Counselor | 8th Grade Guidance Counselor, 504 & FIT Coordinator-provides focused support of students. |
| Juste, Mernise | School Counselor | 6th Grade Guidance Counselor, 504 & FIT Coordinator-provides focused support of students. |
| Leonard, Sherry | Dean | Provides 6th-8th grade level discipline and EWS data. |
| Metz, Dylan | School Counselor | 7th Grade Guidance Counselor, 504 & FIT Coordinator-provides focused support of students. |
| Reynolds, Heather | Other | Science Data and Stocktake Point Person |
| Stanley, Christine | Dean | Provides 6th-8th grade level discipline and EWS data. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|----------------|---|
| Wybiral, Juanita | Reading Coach | Provides curricular intervention and provides progress monitoring data for district and state assessment. |
| Stewart, Melissa | Other | Testing Coordinator and MTSS Coach |

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.

SIP committee members attending district trainings on how to develop the SIP. Department heads point people sat down with the assistant principal and a dean to discuss data. The administrative team went to each PLC for goals and next steps. These goals and next steps were implemented in the stocktake process and used to develop the SIP. The SIP committee presented everything to SAC and SAC gave us feedback which was used to help develop 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 monitored through the Stocktake process monthly and the SIP committee will share with SAC throughout the year to ensure continuous improvement.

Stocktake Meeting Dates:

September 28th
October 26th
November 16th
December 14th
January 25th
February 22nd
March 28th
April 25th
May 23rd

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 | 65% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 65% |
| 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: B 2018-19: B 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 | 12 | 17 | 12 | 41 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 13 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 13 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 19 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 95 | 117 | 302 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 | 81 | 96 | 301 | |
| 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 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 25 |

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

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 | 12 | 17 | 12 | 41 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 13 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 13 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 19 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 95 | 117 | 302 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 | 81 | 96 | 301 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 95 | 117 | 302 | |

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 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 25 |

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

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 | 12 | 17 | 12 | 41 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 13 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 13 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 19 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 95 | 117 | 302 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 | 81 | 96 | 301 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 95 | 117 | 302 | |

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 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 25 |

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

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* | 45 | 41 | 49 | 48 | 44 | 50 | 51 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 46 | | | 49 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 40 | | | 36 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 57 | 46 | 56 | 55 | 35 | 36 | 53 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 60 | | | 47 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 60 | | | 44 | | |

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement* | 60 | 47 | 49 | 62 | 44 | 53 | 63 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 73 | 64 | 68 | 79 | 54 | 58 | 77 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 79 | 79 | 73 | 82 | 51 | 49 | 79 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 49 | 49 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | 69 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 38 | 41 | 40 | 59 | 81 | 76 | 50 | | |

* 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 | 59 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 352 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 59 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 591 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| 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 | 37 | Yes | 4 | |
| ELL | 43 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 79 | | | |
| BLK | 60 | | | |
| HSP | 56 | | | |
| MUL | 54 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 69 | | | |
| FRL | 54 | | | |

| 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 | 35 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 47 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 73 | | | |
| BLK | 55 | | | |
| HSP | 55 | | | |
| MUL | 62 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | | | |
| FRL | 54 | | | |

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 | 45 | | | 57 | | | 60 | 73 | 79 | | | 38 |
| SWD | 20 | | | 34 | | | 32 | 42 | 58 | | 5 | |
| ELL | 25 | | | 45 | | | 18 | 56 | 73 | | 6 | 38 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 75 | | | 83 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| BLK | 39 | | | 51 | | | 60 | 59 | 91 | | 5 | |
| HSP | 40 | | | 55 | | | 53 | 70 | 78 | | 6 | 38 |
| MUL | 44 | | | 44 | | | 50 | 67 | 64 | | 5 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 51 | | | 62 | | | 70 | 80 | 80 | | 5 | |
| FRL | 36 | | | 49 | | | 52 | 70 | 72 | | 6 | 42 |

| 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 | 48 | 46 | 40 | 55 | 60 | 60 | 62 | 79 | 82 | | | 59 |
| SWD | 21 | 35 | 32 | 28 | 50 | 49 | 24 | 42 | | | | |
| ELL | 28 | 36 | 38 | 33 | 52 | 53 | 35 | 57 | 75 | | | 59 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 67 | 73 | | 79 | 71 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | 53 | 54 | 51 | 59 | 58 | 50 | 74 | | | | |
| HSP | 43 | 43 | 37 | 47 | 60 | 59 | 52 | 73 | 77 | | | 56 |
| MUL | 45 | 47 | | 58 | 59 | 62 | 67 | 95 | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 49 | 42 | 66 | 61 | 67 | 73 | 87 | 87 | | | |
| FRL | 40 | 42 | 39 | 46 | 60 | 62 | 53 | 74 | 78 | | | 45 |

| 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 | 51 | 49 | 36 | 53 | 47 | 44 | 63 | 77 | 79 | | | 50 |
| SWD | 28 | 43 | 34 | 29 | 43 | 38 | 41 | 51 | | | | |
| ELL | 25 | 43 | 46 | 28 | 40 | 47 | 34 | 52 | | | | 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 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | 48 |
| MUL | 49 | 39 | | 53 | 44 | | 47 | 56 | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 52 | 40 | 63 | 51 | 57 | 74 | 84 | 87 | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 45 | 35 | 43 | 40 | 38 | 55 | 71 | 66 | | | 42 |

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 | 40% | 39% | 1% | 47% | -7% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 45% | 40% | 5% | 47% | -2% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 39% | 39% | 0% | 47% | -8% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 49% | 40% | 9% | 54% | -5% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 44% | 39% | 5% | 48% | -4% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 61% | 48% | 13% | 55% | 6% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 52% | 35% | 17% | 44% | 8% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 84% | 40% | 44% | 50% | 34% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 90% | 36% | 54% | 48% | 42% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 100% | 65% | 35% | 63% | 37% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 72% | 63% | 9% | 66% | 6% |

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.

Historically, over the past several years, ELA data declined in achievement. In 2022, ELA achievement was 48% and declined to 42% in 2023. 2022-2023 ESSA subgroup data revealed a trend in SWD data, aligning to the decrease in ELA achievement and lowest quartile. Acceleration data revealed that ESSA subgroup categories either maintained or decreased achievement from 2022-2023.

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

ELA achievement data revealed a decline from 48% to 42% from 2022-2023. Our students with disabilities data also revealed a decrease in several categories from 2022-2023. SWD data revealed a 7% decrease in ELA achievement, from 21% to 18%. Some factors that contributed to this decline are change in literacy coaches, high teacher turnover, and not keeping adequate student documentation.

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.

Students With Disabilities (SWD) and ELA had the greatest gap. Some factors that contributed to this decline are not including ESE Teachers in Regular Curriculum Trainings, not training teachers how to keep documentation for BIPs and IEPs, and regular education teacher and special education teachers having time to plan with each other.

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

Math showed the biggest improvement in achievement gains, boosting achievement from 55% to 62%. The math department utilized progress monitoring data and additional tutoring sessions to bridge gaps in knowledge.

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

After reflecting on Part I, our incoming 6th graders show a significant amount of level 1 math on Statewide Math Assessment. In addition, a significant amount of 8th graders are showing a level 1 ELA Achievement Level.

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

1. Maintain student safety while increasing student achievement.
2. Build relationships with stakeholders.
3. Increasing SWD achievement levels.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

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 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.

Insight Climate/Culture Monthly Survey
7 Stages Self-assessment Rubric
Monthly stocktake
Attendance for Teacher PBIS Activities

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Morghan Cameron (morghan.cameron@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.)

Kagan strategies such as Rally Robin and Stand Share Sit.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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, 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!"

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.

PLT - Kagan strategies implemented into classrooms.

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

By When: March

PLT - PD on Kagan structures

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

By When: January

Teacher mentoring program

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

By When: April

Monthly Insight Climate/Cultural Survey

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

By When: April

Monthly appreciation activities for faculty and staff.

Person Responsible: Christina Harrell (christina.harrell@osceolaschools.net)

By When: April

#2. 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.

Based on the 2022-23 school data, ELA proficiency was 42%. Proactive actions are needed to achieve the goal of ensuring higher levels of ELA achievement for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The outcome for 2023-2024 is to increase ELA proficiency by 8%, increasing the achievement level from 42% to 50%. With the addition of STAR Renaissance Reading the goal for the entire campus is 60% of the students to achieve the on watch or above grade level achievement.

Monitoring:

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

Achieve3000, STAR Renaissance, and FAST data will be used to monitor students. HD Word will be utilized in Intensive Reading Classes to build the gaps in knowledge. Students will be assigned into PRIDE groups based on differentiated needs seen in PM1 data. Teachers will utilize SWD data to incorporate differentiated small-group instruction within the PRIDE groups. The administration team, leadership team, and Literacy Coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used to determine and create differentiated instruction opportunities and data results. The leadership team will monitor classroom observations and improvement in student achievement on formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Juanita Wybiral (juanita.wybiral@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.)

Research has shown that utilizing student progress monitoring and achievement data to determine instructional decision assists instructional staff with cultivating diverse instruction. Through the collaborative PLT structure and analysis of formative and summative data allows the team to adjust instruction to cultivate a productive environment for increasing student achievement and learning gains. Additionally, research indicates that use of the MTSS model to support differentiation has a severe impact on student achievement gains. Students will be utilizing PRIDE groups based on the differentiated needs. Teachers will utilize SWD data to incorporate differentiated small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Achieve3000, STAR Renaissance, and FAST data will be used to monitor students. Research conducted by Marzano (2003) and Willaim (2007) identified a consistent correlation between student achievement and the utilization of rigorous and standards-aligned curriculum. This is proven consistent through the use of common assessments and a vertically aligned curriculum to develop formative assessments.

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.

Foundational Instructional Practices (Rigor, Expectations, Engagement)-WICOR strategies used in instruction as well as cornerstone tasks embedded in the CUPs.-Achieve3000 Lexile LevelSet to determine teacher led rotation

Person Responsible: Juanita Wybiral (juanita.wybiral@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September

Reading Coach will conduct coaching cycles to determine the needs for professional development and follow up with classroom walkthroughs to monitor implementation.

Person Responsible: Juanita Wybiral (juanita.wybiral@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October

STAR Reading data/program will provide additional interventions for PRIDE classes for entire ELA department.

Person Responsible: Juanita Wybiral (juanita.wybiral@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October

Progress Monitoring-Differentiated small groups utilized to re-teach lowest achieving standards through FAST PM1 and PM2, Achieve3000 Weekly monitoring, and Star data.

Person Responsible: Juanita Wybiral (juanita.wybiral@osceolaschools.net)

By When: April

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

62% of students at St. Cloud Middle scored at proficiency in the mathematics 2022-2023 state performance test. The results reflect a 22% increase in math proficiency. A strong emphasis on hands-on-manipulatives factors into the substantial increase. There needs to be a focus on active engagement activities across the math department and less lecturing. An increase in hands on materials must continue as teachers become more comfortable with manipulatives.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Math proficiency will increase by 5%. The math achievement level will increase from 62% to 67%.

Monitoring:

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

The math coach will continue to perform weekly walk-throughs where teachers will receive immediate feedback form coding that reflects district expectations. Administration will monitor instructional practices and give specific formal observation feedback.

Administration and PLC Facilitator will monitor beginning-mid-end of year PLC 7-stages progress of the PLC teams. PLC SMART Goals will be monitored for progress.

Stocktake meetings will occur monthly. Progress will be documented on the heat map.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Fontaine (kevin.fontaine@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.)

Tier 3 intervention will utilize Osceola Numeracy Project (ONP) schoolwide. ONP will be implemented as one class per grade level. The math department will also be trained to implement ONP during the remediation period twice a week. All VE support will be trained to implement ONP during Learning Strategies class twice a week. ONP will utilize student interviews and progress monitoring data to remediate effectively. Teachers will implement Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards into lesson plans and continue with content previews with manipulatives that help build students' concrete knowledge.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Osceola Numeracy Project (ONP) yielded excellent results the previous two years when facilitated with fidelity. Implementing content previews with hands on materials building students' knowledge from concrete to representational to abstract.

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.

Proportions and ratios student interviews will be conducted in August. Progress monitoring will cycle every two weeks.

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

By When: September

Multiplication and division student interviews will be conducted in November. Progress monitoring will cycle every two weeks.

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

By When: December

Addition and subtraction student interviews will be conducted in February. Progress monitoring will cycle every two weeks.

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

By When: March

All VE support and mathematics teachers will be Ocala Numeracy Project trained by the end of October 27th.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: October

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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 targeted interventions and support through the MTSS process, students in multiple subgroups will increase their achievement levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The outcome for 2023-2024 is to increase SWD ELA proficiency by 7%, increasing the achievement level from 18% to 25%. Increase ELL ELA proficiency by 5%, increasing the achievement level from 23% to 28%.

Monitoring:

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

All teachers across content areas will increase the amount of time students are reading, writing, and talking in the classroom. Students who need additional interventions and support will be addressed through the MTSS process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Stanley (christine.stanley@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.)

Data on subgroups is analyzed monthly at Stocktake Meetings and problem solved. Differentiated approaches will occur for ELL, ESE, and multi-racial students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When targeted interventions are provided at the right time, students are able to close the achievement gap. Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as creating a balance between academic content and students' individual needs. They suggest that this balance is achieved by modifying four specific elements related to curriculum:

Content- the information and skills that students need to learn
 Process -how students make sense of the content being taught
 Product - how students demonstrate what they have learned
 Affect - the feelings and attitudes that affect students' learning.

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?

Yes

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.

MTSS meets weekly to address subgroup (ELL, ESE, Multiracial) area needs for Tier 2 & 3 in Math/ Reading/ Behavior).

Person Responsible: Melissa Stewart (melissa.stewart@osceolaschools.net)

By When: April

Intervention Time is used to address specific subgroup needs.

Person Responsible: Melissa Stewart (melissa.stewart@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

Data on subgroups is analyzed monthly at Stocktake Meetings and problem solve.

Person Responsible: Carrie Barley (carrie.barley@osceolaschools.net)

By When: March

Teachers will be trained on how to Read, Track, and implement IEPs and BIPs.

Person Responsible: Carrie Barley (carrie.barley@osceolaschools.net)

By When: December

Teachers will keep track of ESE Students who are refusing accommodations and encourage the use of accommodations.

Person Responsible: Carrie Barley (carrie.barley@osceolaschools.net)

By When: April

Keeping student documentation on Focus for accommodations and contact with parents.

Person Responsible: Carrie Barley (carrie.barley@osceolaschools.net)

By When: April

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**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.

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 7% from 73% to 80% 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 (morphan.cameron@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.)

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 Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

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.

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

Person Responsible: Tina Wybiral (tina.wybiral@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly

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

Person Responsible: Tina Wybiral (tina.wybiral@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Weekly - Tuesdays

Create a test bank for each unit providing test accommodations for ESE Students through School City (ability for test to be read to ESE Students electronically).

Person Responsible: Tina Wybiral (tina.wybiral@osceolaschools.net)

By When: April

Administer baseline, midway, and final district assessments to monitor progress and adjust intervention period as needed.

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

By When: April

#6. 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.

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 60% to 65%

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 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.)

- Participate in academic discourse through collaborative structures
- Engage in active learning experiences
- Process learning using interactive science notebooks

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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)

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.

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)

By When: April

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: Christina Harrell (christina.harrell@osceolaschools.net)

By When: November

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)

By When: April

All teachers implement spiral review, common district assessments, instructional focus calendars, and EPR.

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

By When: November

Teachers will participate in PDs that will include SWD strategies, AVID strategies including Kagan, WICOR, Cornell notes, interactive notebooks, and accommodations.

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

By When: November

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)).

The literacy coach will be working with the ESSA subgroups on differentiated instruction through HD Word, Words Their Way, and modeling teacher pull-out stations to best support the needs of each student based on IEP, 504, and varying exceptionalities. The Leadership Team will also work on training teachers how to read, track, and collect data on BIPs while working with SWD.