Harmony Middle School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Harmony Middle School

3725 ARTHUR J GALLAGHER BLVD, St. Cloud, FL 34771

www.osceolaschools.net

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Harmony Middle school inspires young minds to cultivate individual talents and achieve lifelong success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Wranglers are forging a culture of enthusiastic learning, purposeful growth and responsible, global citizenship.

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
Brown, Amanda	Reading Coach	Support teachers in reading instruction; plan and execute professional development
Mello, Karalyn	Math Coach	Ms. Mello is responsible for ensuring math and science teachers are utilizing effective strategies in their day to day classroom activities. She is also a new teacher mentor and facilitates training for new teachers, as well as provide ongoing support.
Carratala, Yajaira	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Carratala is our Resource Compliance Specialist. She oversees execution of student IEP's and leads our VE teachers to ensure their schedules are in compliance for full student support. She also provides training for our teachers to ensure student needs are met via accommodations and modifications as per their IEP's,
Clark, Kyle	Assistant Principal	Mr. Calrk is an Assistant Principal at Harmony Middle School. He is responsible for student services, evaluating teachers, facilities and facility use, campus safety coverage, surveillance, Positive Behavioral Intervention Support. Mr. Clark oversees our custodial staff as well.
Knappins, Krista	Administrative Support	Ms. Knappins is our testing coordinator and MTSS Coach.
Telemko, Frank	Principal	Mr. Telemko is Principal of Harmony Middle School. He is responsible for School Advisory Council, Professional Learning Communities and the School Improvement Plan. Mr. Telemko evaluates Science and Social Studies teachers as well as leadership teams members (NCIPE). As principal, he oversees instruction, the school budget, ensures campus safety and security, and is an instructional leader for his staff by ensuring professional development opportunities are available to his staff and maintains the lines of communication open within his leadership team and all his stakeholders.
Smith, Betty	Dean	Ms. Smith is one of our three deans of students. She oversees 8th grade discipline, Check and Connect and supports PBIS.
Renninger, Megan	Dean	Ms. Renninger is one of our three deans of students. She oversees 6th grade discipline and supports PBIS.
Nowak, Herbert	School Counselor	Mr. Nowak is one of 3 school counselors. He oversees 504 compliance, Panorama survey, running small groups along with assisting students, teachers and parents.
Libby, Sarah	School Counselor	Ms. Libby is one of 2 school counselors. She supports with 504 plans, running small groups along with assisting students, teachers and parents.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
DeRight, Matthew	Assistant Principal	Mr. DeRight is Assistant Principal at Harmony Middle School. He is responsible for the Guidance department, School Improvement Plan, Master Schedule, social media and Stocktake. Mr. DeRight oversees the Math, ESE, electives and CTE Departments as well as paraprofessionals.

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 school leadership team developed the School Improvement Plan. Input was given from our leadership team as each team member collected information from each department on what can be improved for the next school year. At the last SAC meeting of the 2022-23 school year the SAC members were given an opportunity to give input and feedback for the School Improvement plan for the 2023-24 school year. The School Advisory Council will review and approve the School Improvement Plan at our September 12, 2023 SAC meeting.

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 School Improvement Plan will be monitored via our monthly StockTake meetings. Each month our leadership team takes ownership of a particular portion of the school improvement plan. They are accountable for implementation and monitoring of action steps. Every month the stocktake meeting takes place where we check in on the progress and results of action steps taken and revise our school improvement plan if necessary with additional action steps. We will share our actions steps and updates at our monthly SAC meetings with our stakeholders.

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	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	47%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification	ATSI

*updated as of 3/11/2024	
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
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	29	24	35	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	61	63	192
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	62	90	206
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	72	36	202
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	27	28	36	91

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	27	46
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	33	53
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	61	91	202
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	71	68	229
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	27	29	59

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	27	46
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	33	53
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	61	91	202
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	71	68	229
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	27	29	59

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	51	41	49	56	44	50	57		
ELA Learning Gains				47			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			37		
Math Achievement*	56	46	56	59	35	36	52		
Math Learning Gains				58			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			32		
Science Achievement*	56	47	49	55	44	53	55		
Social Studies Achievement*	74	64	68	74	54	58	76		
Middle School Acceleration	76	79	73	83	51	49	80		
Graduation Rate					49	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	36	41	40	40	81	76	36		

* 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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	349
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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	562
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	2	2
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	58			
HSP	56			
MUL	65			
PAC				

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%
WHT	64			
FRL	49			

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	30	Yes	1	1
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	56			
HSP	52			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	51			

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	51			56			56	74	76			36
SWD	18			21			30	42	30		5	
ELL	43			44			40	64	87		6	36
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41			49			56	85			4	
HSP	50			50			53	70	80		6	31

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
MUL	67			62							2	
PAC												
WHT	52			60			58	77	74		5	
FRL	42			44			45	69	65		6	31

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	56	47	33	59	58	57	55	74	83			40
SWD	21	34	23	24	38	33	24	41				
ELL	38	47	30	44	55	45	20	41	75			40
AMI												
ASN	64	60		91	91							
BLK	55	56		50	62	67	42	60				
HSP	50	43	29	52	59	54	46	66	83			40
MUL	71	50		80	58							
PAC												
WHT	59	49	37	62	56	58	59	78	83			
FRL	45	43	35	47	56	57	41	64	73			

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	57	50	37	52	39	32	55	76	80			36
SWD	16	25	19	11	24	29	17	36				
ELL	29	42	39	24	24	25	26	41	71			36
AMI												
ASN				80								
BLK	44	38	0	37	35	50	41	79				
HSP	51	51	39	45	34	30	45	66	77			45
MUL	56	50		56	39							
PAC												
WHT	61	50	38	58	41	32	62	80	82			

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
FRL	46	44	34	40	34	34	45	67	71			

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	45%	39%	6%	47%	-2%
08	2023 - Spring	51%	40%	11%	47%	4%
06	2023 - Spring	45%	39%	6%	47%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	48%	40%	8%	54%	-6%
07	2023 - Spring	46%	39%	7%	48%	-2%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	48%	6%	55%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	50%	35%	15%	44%	6%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	81%	40%	41%	50%	31%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	36%	64%	48%	52%

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	73%	63%	10%	66%	7%

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA - lowest 25th percentile. The contributing factors to this was turnover in ELA teachers and two reading positions that were only partially filled during the school year.

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 previous year was ELA learning gains. The contributing factors to this was turnover in ELA teachers and two reading positions that were only partially filled during the school year.

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.

Math 6-8 on level achievement and Algebra achievement. Math achievement was 3 percentage points below the state average. Factors include student's lack of conceptual understanding and inability to answer higher level math questions. Algebra scored 80% passing where the state average was 86%. A contributing factor was the number of students scoring a level 3 in regular 7th grade math and missing pre-algebra skills while being placed into algebra.

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 math students identified in the lowest 25th percentile. The actions our school took were adjusting our intervention assignments with particular teachers, targeted professional development including additional resources available to support student learning and engaging in student data chats.

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

One an area of concern was the number of students scoring a level 1 on FSA ELA PM3 assessment.

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

- Decreasing students missing 10 percent or more school days
- Increasing math achievement to be above the state average
- Increasing ELA achievement to be above the state average
- Maintaining science achievement to stay above the state average
- Create a culture which supports a sense of belonging with an increase on the spring 2024 Panorama survey

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 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.

We had 192 students who had one or more out of school suspensions in the 2022-23 school year.

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

The goal is to decrease the percentage of students with one or more suspensions from 192 to 134 (by 30%).

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

Monthly stocktake meetings with the deans and guidance departments. They will present discipline and attendance data to the team and we will adjust our strategies based on the data. We will also use the student Panorama survey and focus on the sense of belonging element.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Betty Smith (betty.smith@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.)

School leadership team will have data chats with students having the most suspensions from the previous school year. Members of the MTSS team will also mentor identified students with frequent monitoring and discussion of their behavior. An increased focus on positive Behavior Intervention Supports with incentives, goals including positive rereferrals, grade level rewards, token economy. In addition to schoolwide incentives we will also conduct small group interventions for students with behavior concerns. The groups will be conducted by our school counselors. We will create a social skills class for SWD who show a need for increased socio-emotional skills.

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

The rationale for selecting this strategy is that students attend school and show positive behaviors when they feel a sense of belonging and valued by their peers and staff. To support, adults will be given strategies and scenarios by the administration, deans and resource compliance specialist (for students with disabilities) to be proactive rather than reactive in situations.

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.

The action need consists of incentives for the students who are following their ROPES and contributing to the positive culture and environment. Increase distribution of PBIS token economy.

Person Responsible: Megan Renninger (megan.renninger@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 2023 - after the first quarter of the 2023-24 school year.

Conduct a student survey of preferences of what they would like to earn. Increase variety of reward options to be material and non-material rewards. This will also include teacher incentives for using the token economy and positive referrals.

Person Responsible: Cristina VazquezHogue (cristina.vazquezhogue@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 2023 - after the first quarter of the 2023-24 school year.

Mentoring Tier 2 behavior students to improve positive relationships between adults and students.

Person Responsible: Betty Smith (betty.smith@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly charting will be monitored and correlated with data discipline starting in October.

Honor roll assembly celebrating student success

Person Responsible: Herbert Nowak (herbert.nowak@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Quarterly, beginning in October.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

2022-23 data shows that all students have yet achieve on grade level proficiency in the core subject areas (math, science, social studies, ELA/reading). Achievement: ELA 47%; Math 50%; Science 50%; Algebra 80%; Geometry 100%, Civics 73%.

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

Our measurable outcomes are to show an increase of at least 4% proficiency as indicated on Spring 2024 state assessments and increase the proficiency in subgroup of Students with Disabilities by 11% to 41% with frequent data review and adjustments after each administration of FAST and FSAA.

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

This area of focus will be monitored by: progress monitoring assessments, common assessments, midyear mock exams, STAR data, teacher data chats, gradebook grades reports, leadership team data chats. Also included will be teacher monitoring for learning in real time and adjusting instruction to ensure all students are meeting proficiency on state standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew DeRight (matthew.deright@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.)

Studies show that analysis of student assessment data serves a critical role in teacher decision-making and meeting the diverse needs of individual students. Additionally, collaborative analysis of formative and summative assessment to adjust instruction produces significant learning gains for all students, including those with disabilities. Research also indicates that the MTSS model and differentiating appropriately has a great effect on student achievement.

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

Research illustrates a correlation between student achievement and the development of an achievable, rigorous, and aligned curriculum. Additionally, schools that consistently utilize common assessments have the greatest student achievement. The use of common formative assessments, when well implemented, can effectively double the speed of learning, (William. 2007), (Marzano, 2003)

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.

Math: Teachers will use formative data (FAST/STAR/ALEKS) to identify student needs and provide targeted remediation using intervention opportunities such as reteach, small group activities - based in our instructional focus calendar, including manipulatives. (Through interventions in class and allotted school time in the schedule)

Person Responsible: Karalyn Mello (karalyn.mello@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023. Adjustments will be made as students show growth on STAR as well as; December 2023 PM2 and April 2024 PM3 FAST test results.

ESE support in the classroom will occur through the collaboration of the resource compliance specialist and VE teachers supporting in courses by providing ESE strategies and professional development for teachers.

Person Responsible: Yajaira Carratala (yajaira.carratala@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Professional Development: September 2023, December 2023, February 2024.

Civics: Instructional staff will utilize explicit instructional strategies to improve student comprehension of informational text through classroom experiences and common assessments to re-teach areas of weakness. Interventions will take place via MTSS.

Person Responsible: Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@osceolaschools.net)

By When: B.O.Y. Civics mock exam September 2023 data available; January 2024 mock test results

Staff will use progress monitoring data, classroom observations, and engage in data digging with PLC's to identify and a plan of action individual student needs.

Person Responsible: Karalyn Mello (karalyn.mello@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Weekly: Professional Learning Community meetings; individualized meetings with the coaches as needed.

Components of content-relevant strategies will include whole group, small group, and one-on-one conferencing to meet the individual needs of all students, including ESE strategies.

Person Responsible: Yajaira Carratala (yajaira.carratala@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Professional Development: September 2023, December 2023, February 2024.

Targeted, tiered interventions in math and reading (in class and allotted school time in the schedule): Use FAST, Achieve, STAR Renaissance and district and school based common assessments to track student growth.

Person Responsible: Krista Knappins (krista.knappins@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023. Adjustments will be made as students show growth on STAR as well as; December 2023 PM2 and April 2024 PM3 FAST test results.

Math: Professional development that focuses on the development of fluency across grade levels through Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards (MTR) training.

Person Responsible: Karalyn Mello (karalyn.mello@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Professional Development: September 2023, December 2023, February 2024.

Teachers will incorporate AVID strategies (featuring collaboration, WICOR) into their instruction to support all subgroups.

Person Responsible: Betty Smith (betty.smith@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Professional Development: September 2023, December 2023, February 2024., with check in's via classroom walk throughs

Routine data chats with students regarding academic and behavioral progress. Including small group support.

Person Responsible: Sarah Libby (sarah.libby@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023. Adjustments will be made as students show growth on STAR as well as; December 2023 PM2 and April 2024 PM3 FAST test results.

Science: Use NWEA, common school and district assessments, and bell work assessments to track student growth and plan for intervention/enrichment to prepare for the FSSA. Plan for EPR activities within the CUPS.

Person Responsible: Karalyn Mello (karalyn.mello@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 2023. Adjustments will be made as students show growth on STAR as well as; December 2023 NWEA results.

Teachers will participate in Professional Development for best practice strategies to increase student engagement through quality instruction to improve student literacy. Instructional staff will utilize explicit instructional strategies to improve student comprehension of informational text through classroom experiences and other professional development.

Person Responsible: Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Professional Development: September 2023, December 2023, February 2024., with check in's via classroom walk throughs

Work with school/district-based science team to develop professional learning that address areas of need specific to science instructional practice and strategies. Teachers will participate in Professional Development for best practice strategies to increase student engagement through quality instruction to improve student literacy.

Person Responsible: Karalyn Mello (karalyn.mello@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Professional Development: September 2023, December 2023, February 2024., with check in's via classroom walk throughs

Civics: Teachers will participate in Professional Development for best practice strategies to increase student engagement through quality instruction to improve student literacy.

Person Responsible: Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Professional Development: September 2023, December 2023, February 2024., with check in's via classroom walk throughs

Components of content-relevant strategies will include whole group, small group, and one-on-one conferencing to meet the individual needs of all students, including ESOL strategies.

Person Responsible: Betty Smith (betty.smith@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Professional Development: September 2023, December 2023, February 2024., with check in's via classroom walk throughs; also working with the ELD teacher.

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 reading coach works closely with the Resource Compliance Specialist to ensure all teachers are familiar with student IEPs and required accommodations, providing trainings when necessary. The coach supports teachers who have students with disabilities in their classroom. The reading coach assists teachers with tracking student progress and provides additional progress monitoring. When necessary, the coach analyzes student test history and makes recommendations during staffing meetings.