Neptune Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Neptune Middle School

2727 NEPTUNE RD, Kissimmee, FL 34744

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.

Excellence for all . . . whatever it takes.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Education which inspires all students to achieve their highest potential.

School Leadership Team, 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
Rademacher, Thomas	Principal	The principal oversees the vision and mission of the school. Assigns the roles and responsibilities of the leadership team to ensure the SIP is being monitored. Conducts a monthly Stocktake to monitor the SIP and make adjustments based on the data.
Crisp, Kara	Assistant Principal	In charge of ensuring students are in the appropriate classes through master scheduling. Oversees the MTSS/Intervention process, PLC process, Stoketake Facilitator, and Science Goals.
Franceschi, Frankie	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal that oversees technology, SS/Civics, and Title 1.
Wilson, Lisa	Math Coach	In charge of the math goal. Supports the Math PLC to ensure students are being supported on all levels and monitors progress towards the math goals.
Rosario, Kacie	Staffing Specialist	RCS overseeing IEP staffing and accommodations. As well as progress of students with disabilities based on assessment data.
Lovegrove, Alexandria	Reading Coach	In charge of the literacy goal and ensuring literacy schoolwide. Supports ELA/Reading PLCs to ensure students are being supported on all levels and monitors progress towards the goals.

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

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

The leadership team engages families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations and high-quality instruction and hold staff responsible for implementing any changes. We
frequently communicate high expectations for all students.

For example:
• Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in disaggregated data
• All students participate in college and career readiness lessons
• School offers an array of community engagement opportunities

Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for patterns among student groups. The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making through monthly SAC council meetings and Title 1 parent meetings. Leadership reaches out to families and the community early and often. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students and follow up with what's being done as a result. It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically under-served students.

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))

Administration and coaches will monitor our collaborative teams to ensure fidelity of implementation of best practices to improve student achievement and close learning gaps through Stocktake meetings and observations. SIP will be revised based on outcome of monthly Stocktake and SAC meetings.

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	88%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	96%
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	50	70	65	185
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	50	43	116
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	127	117	354
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	65	50	176
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	
	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	68	74	67	209

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	0	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	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	64	70	106	240
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	68	68	183
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	84	109	261
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	87	113	285
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	5	20

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	61	78	87	226

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	70	106	240
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	68	68	183
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	84	109	261
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	87	113	285
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	5	20

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	61	78	87	226

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	49			52	44	50	50		
ELA Learning Gains				57	46	48	52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38	36	38	47		
Math Achievement*	58			51	44	54	51		
Math Learning Gains				61	54	58	48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61	58	55	42		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	52			52	49	49	60		
Social Studies Achievement*	68			65	68	71	86		
Middle School Acceleration	83			89			81		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	53			50			44		

* 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](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	363
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
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	576
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	29	Yes	4	1
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	66			
BLK	60			
HSP	58			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	73			
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	33	Yes	3	
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	65			
BLK	52			
HSP	56			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	52			

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	49			58			52	68	83			53
SWD	24			35			23	33			4	
ELL	34			42			36	49	81		6	53
AMI												
ASN	56			75							2	
BLK	50			58			43	63	88		5	
HSP	46			53			49	65	81		6	54
MUL	54			73							2	
PAC												
WHT	62			78			61	80	86		5	
FRL	45			52			45	65	77		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	52	57	38	51	61	61	52	65	89			50
SWD	24	37	26	29	57	47	23	28				27
ELL	33	50	35	32	57	59	27	43	86			50
AMI												
ASN	65	67		71	67		55					
BLK	46	54	43	44	60	72	37	41	73			
HSP	50	56	39	49	61	61	50	64	88			46
MUL	54	64		42	48		50	91				
PAC												
WHT	62	60	35	65	67	65	70	79	93			
FRL	44	51	35	42	54	54	41	56	84			56

| 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	50	52	47	51	48	42	60	86	81			44
SWD	28	44	37	29	40	36	35	64				33
ELL	25	45	45	28	41	40	31	73	65			44

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	79	76		79	65		100					
BLK	44	49	38	44	37	33	50	89	92			
HSP	46	51	47	47	46	42	53	83	77			45
MUL	62	56		57	50							
PAC												
WHT	63	55	45	67	57	55	78	95	89			
FRL	41	47	43	42	41	38	52	83	76			48

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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	42%	39%	3%	47%	-5%
08	2023 - Spring	47%	40%	7%	47%	0%
06	2023 - Spring	43%	39%	4%	47%	-4%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	33%	40%	-7%	54%	-21%
07	2023 - Spring	54%	39%	15%	48%	6%
08	2023 - Spring	66%	48%	18%	55%	11%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	41%	35%	6%	44%	-3%

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	91%	36%	55%	48%	43%

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	65%	63%	2%	66%	-1%

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.

Based on the 2022-23 FAST data 6th grade math and 7th grade ELA showed the lowest performance overall. One of the contributing factors to the low performance in 6th grade math was due to a lapse of a teacher which impacted tier 1 instruction. The contributing factor to the low performance in 7th grade ELA was a decline in the usage of high yield instructional strategies.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was 7th grade ELA. The two most impactful factors for this decline were the usage of high yield instructional strategies and program effectiveness.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap was 6th grade Math. The reason for the gap was a lapse of a teacher which impacted tier 1 instruction.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was 8th grade Mathematics. Our school used fluid scheduling and deliberate interventions to increase student achievement.

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

Based on the EWS data our primary area of concern is the exorbitant number of students that scored a level one on the ELA FAST PM 3.

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

1. 6th Math
2. 7th ELA

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

Based on the 2022-23 school data, ELA proficiency overall was 48% and SWD subgroup had a proficiency of 22% for ELA. Productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of ELA achievement for all students.

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

The outcome for 2023-24 is to increase the overall ELA proficiency by 14% to reach the goal of 62%. In addition, the SWD subgroup will increase by 19% to reach the goal of 41% proficient.

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

Achieve, STAR and FAST data will be used to monitor students. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Literacy Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus using this data.
Administration and the ELA Coach will monitor that teachers are using best practices and high yield strategies to improve instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alexandria Lovegrove (alexandria.lovegrove@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 leadership team will analyze student assessment data to drive decision making to support teachers in meeting the diverse needs of all students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of assessment data to adjust instruction and pinpoint areas of focus for significant learning gains for all students, including students with disabilities. Tier 3 students will use a combination of small group instruction and HD Word to fill in foundational gaps and strengthen grade level knowledge. Tier 2 intervention will be done daily during the schoolwide intervention period. Teachers will use the previously mentioned data to identify areas of focus and use practice assessment books to target those specific areas of needs. Students will work in small group with the teacher.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will use guaranteed and viable curriculum to ensure all students are receiving rigorous grade level instruction to improve student achievement. Not only will teachers remediate for struggling students but also accelerate for those students exceeding grade level expectations. Based on previous years state assessment data, there is a high need of foundational skills practice. According to John Hattie using phonics instruction, such as HD Word, has an effect of .70 on student learning. (Hattie, 2017)

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.

Collaborative Planning/Professional Learning Communities - Reading coach will attend grade level PLCs and help with data disaggregation,
backward planning, common assessments and guidance on curriculum.

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

By When: First PLC Cycle completed by October 1, 2023

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

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

By When: December Stocktake 2023

Standards Aligned Instruction - PDs given on Standards and CUPs to ensure standards aligned instruction. Literacy Coach will monitor for task and target alignment following the PDs.

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

By When: December Stocktake 2023

Literacy Coach will support Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices (Rigor, Expectations, Engagement)

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

By When: December Stocktake 2023

#2. 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.

Based on the 2022-23 school data, Science proficiency overall was 52% and SWD subgroup had a proficiency of 20% for science. Productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of science 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 2023-24 is to increase science proficiency by 4% to reach the goal of 56%. In addition, SWD proficiency will increase by 21% to reach the goal of 41%.

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

NWEA and the district mock assessment data will be used to monitor students. School Stock take Model will take place every month and the Science PLT Lead will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus using this data. Administration will monitor that teachers are using best practices and high yield strategies to improve instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kara Crisp (kara.crisp@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 leadership team will analyze student assessment data to drive decision making to support teachers in meeting the diverse needs of all students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of assessment data to adjust instruction and pinpoint areas of focus for significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Science teachers will support students with disabilities during their intervention period using reading and math strategies to improve student achievement. In addition, the students will work in a rotational model to remediate science standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will use guaranteed and viable curriculum to ensure all students are receiving rigorous grade level instruction to improve student achievement. not only will teachers remediate for struggling students but also accelerate for those students exceeding grade level expectations. Based on data, we are using cross curricular activities to improve student achievement for students with disabilities. According to John Hattie using Science programs, such as Penda, has an effect of .48 on student learning. (Hattie, 2017)

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.

Collaborative Planning/Professional Learning Communities - Science PLC Lead will attend grade level PLCs and help with data disaggregation, backward planning, common assessments and guidance on curriculum.

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

By When: December Stocktake 2023

Standards Aligned Instruction - PDs given on Standards and CUPs to ensure standards aligned instruction. Instructional coaches will monitor for task and target alignment following the PDs.

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

By When: December Stocktake 2023

#3. 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.

Based on the 2022-23 school data, Civics proficiency was 68%, productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of science 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 2023-24 is to increase Civis proficiency by 4% to reach the goal of 72%.

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

District mock assessment and common summative assessment data will be used to monitor students. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the AP will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus using this data. Administration will monitor that teachers are using best practices and high yield strategies to improve instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Frankie Franceschi (frankie.franceschi@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 leadership team will analyze student assessment data to drive decision making to support teachers in meeting the diverse needs of all students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of assessment data to adjust instruction and pinpoint areas of focus for significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. History teachers will support students with reading strategies during their intervention period to improve student achievement for students with disabilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will use guaranteed and viable curriculum to ensure all students are receiving rigorous grade level instruction to improve student achievement. Not only will teachers remediate for struggling students but also accelerate for those students exceeding grade level expectations. Due to history content having dense reading material, students will benefit from additional reading focus strategies to improve achievement in both reading and history. According to John Hattie using the reading strategy of concept mapping, has an effect of .64 on student learning. (Hattie, 2017)

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.

Collaborative Planning/Professional Learning Communities - AP will attend grade level PLCs and help with data disaggregate, backward planning, common assessments and guidance on curriculum.

Person Responsible: Frankie Franceschi (frankie.franceschi@osceolaschools.net)

By When: December Stocktake 2023

Standards Aligned Instruction - PDs given on Standards and CUPs to ensure standards aligned instruction. Instructional coaches will monitor for task and target alignment following the PDs.

Person Responsible: Frankie Franceschi (frankie.franceschi@osceolaschools.net)

By When: December Stocktake 2023

#4. 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.

Based on the 2022-23 school data, Math proficiency overall was 62% and SWD subgroup had a proficiency of 38% for Math. Productive actions are necessary to accomplish the goal of ensuring higher levels of Math 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 2023-24 is to increase the overall Math proficiency by 3% to reach the goal of 65%. In addition, the SWD subgroup will increase by 3% to reach the goal of 41% proficient.

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

Aleks, STAR, and FAST data will be used to monitor students. School Stocktake Model will take place every month and the Math Coach will report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus using this data. Administration and the Math Coach will monitor the collaborative teams to ensure time is being used effectively and to evaluate the level of each PLT Team weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Wilson (lisa.wilson@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 leadership team will analyze student assessment data to drive decision making to support teachers in meeting the diverse needs of all students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of assessment data to adjust instruction and pinpoint areas of focus for significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Tier 3 students will use a combination of small group instruction and ALEKS to fill in foundational gaps and strengthen grade level knowledge. Tier 2 intervention will be done daily during the schoolwide intervention period using remediation strategies. Teachers will use the previously mentioned data to identify areas of focus and use math practice assessment books to target those specific areas of needs. Students will work in small group with the teacher.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will use guaranteed and viable curriculum to ensure all students are receiving rigorous grade level instruction to improve student achievement. Not only will teachers remediate for struggling students but also accelerate for those students exceeding grade level expectations. Based on previous years state assessment data, there is a high need of foundational skills practice. According to John Hattie using a Mathematics program, such as ALEKS, has an effect of .59 on student learning. (Hattie, 2017)

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.

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

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

By When: December Stocktake 2023

Differentiation, Small Group Instruction, Tier 2 & 3 Instructional Interventions. Utilize ALEKS, STAR, FAST data to differentiate students into groups for tier 2 & 3 interventions.

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

By When: December Stocktake 2023

Standards Aligned Instruction - PDs given on Standards and CUPs to ensure high leverage instructional practices.

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

By When: December Stocktake 2023

Monitor/support Tier 1 Foundational Instructional Practices (Rigor, Expectations, Engagement)

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

By When: December Stocktake 2023

#5. 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.

Well-implemented programs designed to foster life skills lessons are associated with positive outcomes, ranging from better test scores and higher graduation rates to improved social behavior. Social-emotional competencies include skills, such as the ability to collaborate and make responsible decisions; mindsets, such as thinking positively about how to handle challenges; and habits, such as coming to class prepared. A positive school climate includes a safe environment, strong student and staff relationships and supports for learning. It provides the foundation that students need, to develop the life skills and academic competencies they need to succeed in life. There is a schoolwide focus on AVID to promote students working towards a goal that will set them up for success postsecondary education.

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

2022-23 SEL Climate Survey showed 41% of students answered favorable for school belonging. In 2023-2024 the percent of students answering this question favorably will increase by 5% by year end. We expect to show a 3% increase by midyear.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Thomas Rademacher (thomas.rademacher@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.)

Students are diverse in their learning styles and needs. Therefore, data will be used to track and provide interventions on an individual basis. Interventions will include being involved in a minimum of two activities. Activities could include sports, clubs, fine arts, robotics/STEM, AVID, and student leadership opportunities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A positive culture and environment are based around student centered activities that give students a sense of belonging. Therefore, students will be provided opportunities to pursue their individual interests. According to John Hattie students participating in afterschool programs has an effect of .40 on student learning. (Hattie, 2017)

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 and staff will plan two activities that are engaging and relevant to students and provide them during the first semester that identify and building on students' individual interests.

Person Responsible: Thomas Rademacher (thomas.rademacher@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Reviewed and updated in December Stocktake meeting.

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

Person Responsible: Thomas Rademacher (thomas.rademacher@osceolaschools.net)

By When: December 2023 Stocktake

Teachers will facilitate collaborative learning within their lessons to increase sense of belonging.

Person Responsible: Thomas Rademacher (thomas.rademacher@osceolaschools.net)

By When: December 2023 Stocktake

PBIS will be implemented with fidelity throughout all aspects of the school and monitored through the PBIS leadership team.

Person Responsible: Thomas Rademacher (thomas.rademacher@osceolaschools.net)

By When: December 2023 Stocktake

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 SAC members vote on spending of available funds to ensure students are provided with resources to support academic growth. Title 1 funds are used to improve student achievement schoolwide and engage families and communities. This is done through Title 1 family nights and use of funds for staff allocations to improve student learning. These allocations include a Math Coach, Intensive Math Teacher, and three Paraprofessionals for student support. The Math Coach will support teachers through professional development on best strategies to support students with disabilities. The Intensive Math Teacher will focus on foundational number sense skills to reinforce students with disabilities math progression. The Paraprofessionals will work directly with students in small groups to help students with disabilities to be successful in Reading and Math.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP plan is a "living document" that is refined and monitored by all stakeholders. The SIP plan is reviewed during SAC meetings and parent informational meetings to ensure all stakeholders have a voice in the process of ensuring all students are successful.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available.
(ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school provides the parent family engagement plan to all families as part of the first day packet. Parents may also access the parent family engagement plan at Osceolaschools.net/NPMS. The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet student needs and provide frequent, constructive feedback, and actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making through SAC council. Staff reaches out to families and the community early and often. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students and follow up with what's being done as a result. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation, and provide food and childcare). It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically under-served students.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support. They also provide frequent, constructive feedback, and actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. They also structure the master schedule to include collaborative planning and ensure it is rooted in data on student progress and interests. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. The schools, curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Neptune Middle School will coordinate the development of the School Improvement Plan alongside several federal, state, and local services, such as: Title I, Part A for the implementation of supplemental education for disadvantaged students; Title II, Part A for the implementation of various Professional Development opportunities to support teacher growth; Title III for the implementation of Multicultural services; Title IV, Part A for the implementation of student enrichment activities; Title IX for the

implementation and support of students and families in transition; and Perkins Career and Technical Education for the implementation of post secondary opportunities and experiences.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

As a school, we conduct Panaroma surveys twice a year to assess school culture and SEL concerns for individuals. School counselors and leadership team members create programs based on the data collected from the Panaroma surveys.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Each grade level is required to complete a series of Xello lessons annually to investigate and research post-secondary opportunities.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

The school uses the MTSS process to identify and address specific behavior and academic concerns.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Professional development is provided by academic coaches to ensure high leverage instructional strategies are used schoolwide. A mentor program is used to support and retain new teachers.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

NA