
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Osceola Middle School

825 SW 28TH ST, Okeechobee, FL 34974

<http://osceolamiddleschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/>

Demographics

Principal: Sean Downing

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2010

2019-20 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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (49%) 2020-21: (47%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Kati Pearson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Okeechobee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

OMS, partnering with families and the community, will empower all students to reach their maximum potential and be successful in their future endeavors.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Prepare today for YOUR tomorrow.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Downing, Sean	Principal	<p>I am currently serving in my thirteenth year as a principal in Okeechobee County, and have spent my entire career in this organization. I am responsible for leading all aspects of the educational and business functions at Osceola Middle School, a comprehensive Title 1 public school. We have approximately 800 students and 75 employees. In addition to responsibilities at the school site, I have served the last several years on middle school curriculum map design and on our instructional evaluation committee at the district level. I also spent time training administrators on our evaluation system. I annually attend several recruiting fairs both in and out of state. I also serve as one of the administrators on our targeted selection process. My school has been recognized with a school grade of B in three of the last four years. Our math scores were recognized for the ninth largest improvements in growth among all middle schools in the state (2016). I was the recipient of the Governor's Shine Award (2017). I was selected to participate in the Dr. Brian Dassler Commissioner's Leadership Academy (2015), Dr. Brian Dassler Commissioner's Leadership Academy-Facilitator in Training (2016), Florida Association of School Administrators Instructional Leadership Team Initiative Pilot (2017) and the Instructional Partners Middle School Coaching Pilot (2018). I was selected as the Okeechobee County District Principal of the Year (2020).</p>
Potter, Greg	Assistant Principal	
Wendt, Tami	Instructional Coach	
Jarriel, Glenda	Dean	
Maggard, Sara	Guidance Counselor	
Nielson, Taylor	Guidance Counselor	
Talavera, Jessica	Other	ESE Resource Specialist
Zerquera, Carlos	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2010, Sean Downing

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

696

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	246	231	221	0	0	0	0	698
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	79	84	0	0	0	0	234
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	54	46	0	0	0	0	168
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	38	31	0	0	0	0	84
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	44	27	0	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	66	70	0	0	0	0	211
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	51	40	0	0	0	0	176
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	19	9	0	0	0	0	49

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	87	76	0	0	0	0	260

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	17	19	0	0	0	0	49
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	6	0	0	0	0	19

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 6/24/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	238	229	219	0	0	0	0	686
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	57	62	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	30	35	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	19	38	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	39	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	33	36	0	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	44	38	0	0	0	0	110
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	30	18	0	0	0	0	56
Identified Tier 3 MTSS Read Fall 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	30	19	0	0	0	0	57
Identified Tier 3 MTSS Math Fall 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	31	26	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	68	56	0	0	0	0	163
Level 1 on 2021 FSA Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	66	49	0	0	0	0	190

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	38	54	0	0	0	0	111

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	6	0	0	0	0	16

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	238	229	219	0	0	0	0	686
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	57	62	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	30	35	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	19	38	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	39	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	33	36	0	0	0	0	96
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	44	38	0	0	0	0	110
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	30	18	0	0	0	0	56
Identified Tier 3 MTSS Read Fall 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	30	19	0	0	0	0	57
Identified Tier 3 MTSS Math Fall 21	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	31	26	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	68	56	0	0	0	0	163
Level 1 on 2021 FSA Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	66	49	0	0	0	0	190

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	38	54	0	0	0	0	111

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	6	0	0	0	0	16

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%			37%			44%	42%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	46%			38%			49%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%			27%			44%	43%	47%
Math Achievement	51%			55%			63%	61%	58%
Math Learning Gains	56%			47%			59%	60%	57%

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%			45%			54%	56%	51%
Science Achievement	41%			45%			51%	43%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	65%			75%			69%	60%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	46%	47%	-1%	54%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	43%	38%	5%	52%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
08	2022					
	2019	39%	37%	2%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	55%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	57%	55%	2%	54%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
08	2022					
	2019	58%	51%	7%	46%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	48%	41%	7%	48%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	69%	59%	10%	71%	-2%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	90%	52%	38%	61%	29%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	47%	53%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	15	31	29	25	41	45	17	38			
ELL	27	42	35	42	51	52	36	56	45		
ASN	55	70		82	82						
BLK	22	24	33	24	45	57	17	56			
HSP	37	48	34	51	57	54	45	59	60		
MUL	56	59		63	72						
WHT	47	46	33	54	56	50	41	71	53		

2022 SCHOOL GRADE 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
FRL	39	43	29	49	57	55	41	62	55		
2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	13	24	25	26	40	42	19	50			
ELL	18	23	23	42	35	29	24	71	27		
BLK	27	27	17	39	49	53	38				
HSP	29	31	24	55	47	44	44	75	51		
MUL	53	38		67	43						
WHT	44	46	38	56	47	47	46	73	48		
FRL	31	35	25	49	45	37	39	74	43		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	14	37	36	33	48	46	17	33			
ELL	30	44	58	54	55	44	32	48	27		
BLK	27	40	33	46	47	56	33	57			
HSP	42	45	43	61	56	46	53	68	60		
MUL	41	41		56	50						
WHT	47	54	49	68	62	58	50	73	71		
FRL	37	48	44	58	56	52	40	61	62		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	509
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	72
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	50
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

OMS has experienced declines in 6th, 7th, and 8th grade Reading and Math, 8th grade Science, and 7th grade Social Studies proficiency rates since 2019, likely attributable to the COVID-19 slide. Numbers were comparable to what has been seen in Florida and nationally. Literacy rates dropped by 7 points from 2019 to 2021 but then rebounded by 5 points by 2022. Math achievement dropped by 8 points from 2019 to 2021 and then dropped again by 4 more points from 2021 to 2022. Learning gains dropped from 2019 to 2021 in both categories, but have since rebounded in 2022 for the general population. 8th grade Science scores dropped by 6 points (51% to 45%) from 2019 to 2021, and then dropped another 4 points (to 41%) by 2022.

7th-grade Civics scores amazingly rose by 10 points (69% to 79%) from 2019 to 2021, and then dropped by 14 points (to 65%) in 2022. Consequently, the school's FLDOE grade dropped from a low B in 2021 to a high C in 2022. The SWD, Bottom Quartile, lower SES, and Black subgroups showed disproportionate drops as compared to the General Population, higher SES, and Caucasian groups. Specifically, the Bottom Quartile group in both Reading and Math dropped in learning gains from 2019 to 2021, and then the Math Bottom Quartile group rebounded almost equivalent to the general population (53% v 56%), while the Reading Bottom Quartile group did not gain as well comparative to the general population (33% v 46%).

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Literacy, Mathematics, and Science are the areas in greatest need of improvement. Only 42% of OMS students were proficient in 2022. This needs to change. The school has had a long-standing goal to reach the 50% threshold, and it was very nearly there pre-pandemic. Literacy, of course, impacts all other areas of student achievement and success. Learning gains for the Bottom Quartile and ESE groups for literacy are of grave concern, given that they were last recorded in the low 30s. Next, Math achievement has taken the largest overall hit over the past few years, and despite the Bottom Quartile and ESE sub-group successes in learning gains that exceeded 50% last year, the 51% overall achievement figure is concerning. Following this trend unfortunately is Science, which is now in the low 40s when it was in the low 50s.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The COVID-19 Pandemic presented significant challenges in terms of instructional delivery, which during a three-month shutdown in the spring of 2019 disrupted everyone, causing the school to deliver a significantly modified (reduced) level of content and services, if at all in the case of some students who could not access opportunities online. Then, as students returned to school, or chose to attend virtually in the fall of 2020, teachers at OMS were faced with a highly challenging task to teach in person AND online via Zoom at the same time. Attendance rates dropped significantly as compared to pre-pandemic rates, and then continued to be lower during the 2021-2022 school year. Student attitudes and engagement with their studies seemed to change drastically through all of this.

This year, the school has decided to make student engagement a top priority. We need to boost attendance rates by bringing the "fun" back in order to make school a much more attractive place than it was during the pandemic. This year, we plan pep rallies, festivals, socials, dances, family fun nights, and other incentives such as reward trips for increased performance and student effort. We have also planned to strengthen our response to instruction and intervention by solidifying our Professional Learning Team (PLT) protocols and focusing on "essential" standards that all students must master in all content areas. Students will routinely "walk" to intervention or extension based on their performance on common formative assessments, and those demonstrating mastery will have extended learning opportunities.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA achievement rebounded by 5 points from 2021 to 2022 as stated previously. Math General Population and Bottom Quartile subgroups also rebounded well for learning gains (to almost pre-pandemic levels). Algebra proficiency also rebounded fairly well. After dipping to 75% during the pandemic, it went back up to 81%. It had been at 90% in 2019.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

In 2021-22, the school formed an instructional leadership team called the "Guiding Coalition" and implemented a school-wide professional learning team (PLT) process following the Learning by Doing model. Routine opportunities for students to receive intervention services via regularly scheduled "walk to intervention" and/or extension lesson sessions seemed to help with Math and Reading results; especially learning gains in Math. Doing this was much more challenging for Science and Social Studies classes, due to scheduling constraints. These classes met in much shorter blocks of time on a daily basis (45 min v 90 min for ELA and Math). We feel like we almost eliminated the COVID slide gap in Reading and Math, and are now well on the way to regaining pre-pandemic rates in the coming year.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

This year, we have decided to make adjustments to our master schedule to give Science and Social Studies more time to be able to implement intervention services to the same levels achieved by ELA and Math classes last year. We also plan to implement READ 180 routinely as a course assignment for level 1 readers (a Tier 3 intervention), and make Success Maker Math available for use in the Math Program for Tier 3. All Tier 2 and 3 students in our school will continue to receive walk-to intervention services based on their performance on common formative assessments (CFAs) specifically designed to measure their mastery of determined "essential" learning standards. Last, a major goal around focusing on student and teacher assessment literacy, which has been shown in research to highly impact student learning and boost teacher effectiveness, has been established. Students will have "data" binders, which will feature defined and consistent activities associated with determining where they are, where they need to go, and how they will get there. Tracking sheets for essential standard performance mastery and other measures will be incorporated. Finally, a student-led conference involving parents and guardians

will support this goal to enhance assessment literacy. PLT leaders will use the book, "Learning Targets-Helping Students Aim for Understanding" and other resources to ensure clarity of targets and specificity of mastery expectations.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Administrators and academic coaches will conduct a book study on "Leading for Instructional Improvement." OMS has two new coaches, that have had to begin the year teaching in classrooms due to the teacher shortage. Hopefully, as we bring on newly hired instructional staff, they will soon have more time to be working directly with classroom teachers all day, every day to provide coaching cycles and consistent observations with feedback to all core teachers. Professional Learning Team teacher leaders will use "Learning Targets-Helping Students Aim for Understanding" and other resources (such as "The Differentiated Classroom") as they work to refine and strengthen all learning targets and mastery components associated with identified "essential standards" and CFAs. With the goal to improve student and teacher assessment literacy, the planning teams will also diversify formative assessment techniques and menus that allow students to demonstrate their knowledge and skills in ways that honor the expectations of the standards and the unique needs of the students. OMS sent a team to Solution Tree's National Conference in Orlando during the summer. Many of the ideas enumerated herein were contributed by coaches and teachers attending this event. Last, a keen focus on all ELA and Math instructional staff's use of the Branching Minds Program to create and monitor intervention plans is planned. Initial training has been completed in August 2022 and the Assistant Principal and academic coaches will provide "at the elbow" support and guidance all year.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Now that the school has a structure and model for its professional learning community (PLC), it must continue to strengthen it via refinements such as those mentioned herein. In addition, a specific protocol for "de-implementation" of school and/or classroom practices that are either outdated, non-impactful, non-consistent or ineffective, must happen. Specifically, what needs to STOP happening that might get in the way of efficiently and effectively focusing on student RTI? Engagement can be enhanced when the school involves students in their own learning plans, educating them and partnering with them to map out growth strategies that will lead them to success. The school will also be looking at its after-school tutorial program to make it "fit" better with its mission and vision, along with the programmatic changes made in recent years, and those being made this year.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

As we look at past performance, we still see needs in closing some COVID gaps. This, in addition to subgroup data, we see areas that require growth (performance, achievement, learning gains, subgroup, etc.).

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

Our ELA Achievement Level will move from 41 to 45%. Our ELA Learning Gains will increase from 46 to 50%. Our Bottom Quartile will improve from 33 to 45%. Our Math Achievement will improve from 51 to 60%. Math Learning gains will improve from 56 to 65%. Our Bottom Quartile Math will increase from 53 to 60%. Ours Science Achievement will improve from 41 to 47%, with Civics maintaining at 65%.

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

We will utilize our PLC process and a focus on Essential Standards with Walk to Intervention to ensure that all students are showing mastery. We plan to monitor our Essential Standards data, Common Unit Assessment Data and Progress Monitoring (FAST) Data to monitor progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

We will leverage our established Professional Learning Community structure to implement this area of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

After we returned from COVID, we overhauled our approach to planning in order to ensure that more different students were achieving higher levels.

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.

We will utilize student data binders to increase student ownership over their data.

Person Responsible Carlos Zerquera (carlos.zerquera@okee.k12.fl.us)

We will track our performance by teacher, grade level and school versus district performance on Common Unit Assessments.

Person Responsible Tami Wendt (tamara.wendt@okee.k12.fl.us)

We will utilize progress monitoring data in order to drive our MTSS plans.

Person Responsible Greg Potter (gregory.potter@okee.k12.fl.us)

We will disaggregate data and provide additional coaching to teachers

Person Responsible Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

As we look at past performance, we still see needs in closing some COVID gaps. This, in addition to subgroup data, we see areas that require growth (performance, achievement, learning gains, subgroup, etc.).

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

OMS SWD will improve performance in all areas from 30 to 41% according to the federal index.

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

We will utilize our PLC process and a focus on Essential Standards with Walk to Intervention to ensure that all students are showing mastery. We plan to monitor our Essential Standards data, Common Unit Assessment Data and Progress Monitoring (FAST) Data to monitor progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

We will leverage our established Professional Learning Community structure to implement this area of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

After we returned from COVID, we overhauled our approach to planning in order to ensure that more different students were achieving higher levels.

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.

We will utilize student data binders to increase student ownership over their data.

Person Responsible Carlos Zerquera (carlos.zerquera@okee.k12.fl.us)

We will track our performance by teacher, grade level and school versus district performance on Common Unit Assessments.

Person Responsible Tami Wendt (tamara.wendt@okee.k12.fl.us)

We will utilize progress monitoring data in order to drive our individual students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 (MTSS) plans.

Person Responsible Greg Potter (gregory.potter@okee.k12.fl.us)

We will disaggregate data and provide additional coaching to teachers

Person Responsible Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

As we look at past performance, we still see needs in closing some COVID gaps. This, in addition to subgroup data, we see areas that require growth (performance, achievement, learning gains, subgroup, etc.).

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

OMS students identified as African Americans will improve performance in all areas from 35 to 41% according to the federal index..

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

We will utilize our PLC process and a focus on Essential Standards with Walk to Intervention to ensure that all students are showing mastery. We plan to monitor our Essential Standards data, Common Unit Assessment Data and Progress Monitoring (FAST) Data to monitor progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

We will leverage our established Professional Learning Community structure to implement this area of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

After we returned from COVID, we overhauled our approach to planning in order to ensure that more different students were achieving higher levels.

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.

We will utilize student data binders to increase student ownership over their data.

Person Responsible Carlos Zerquera (carlos.zerquera@okee.k12.fl.us)

We will track our performance by teacher, grade level and school versus district performance on Common Unit Assessments.

Person Responsible Tami Wendt (tamara.wendt@okee.k12.fl.us)

We will utilize progress monitoring data in order to drive our individual students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 (MTSS) plans.

Person Responsible Greg Potter (gregory.potter@okee.k12.fl.us)

We will disaggregate data and provide additional coaching to teachers

Person Responsible Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A... this school serves students in grades 6-8.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A... this school serves students in grades 6-8.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A... this school serves students in grades 6-8.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A... this school serves students in grades 6-8.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A... this school serves students in grades 6-8.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A... this school serves students in grades 6-8.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A... this school serves students in grades 6-8.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

N/A... this school serves students in grades 6-8.

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

In addition to the school's vision: "OMS, partnering with families and the community, will empower all students to reach their maximum potential and be successful in their future endeavors."...and mission: "Prepare today for your tomorrow.", OMS follows the motto, "Hard work together." With this year's theme and focus on student engagement, the school has sought to add students to its Guiding Coalition (GC) (i.e. its Instructional Leadership Team (ILT)), and additional parents and community members, including a local Recreational Program Coordinator, and an OCSB School Board member to its School Advisory Committee (SAC). The GC has had direct input in updating the school's mission and vision, and the SAC has been involved in reviewing this work and providing information and input.

OMS is a Positive Behavior Intervention & Support (PBIS) school. Its PBS Team works directly with the district team, in collaboration with the University of South Florida (USF), following its model. This means that it has developed strategies and programs at all tier levels. Tier 1 (schoolwide) featured components include but are not limited to: Reward "spears" ... a paper currency that students earn through a variety of positive behavior and citizenship actions. This currency is used to enter regular school drawings for prizes, a school supply store, an electronics table at lunch, and additional recess time outside during lunchtime. There are also tier 2 and 3 supports, like "check in/check out", mentoring, and other student-specific rewards. The school plans regular events after school, like socials, dances, fun nights, and festivals. Students with good behavior are always allowed to attend, while others might need to earn them. This year, OMS has broadened and deepened its "club" offerings, encouraging teachers and others to offer during and after school sessions. Presently, there are over a dozen club offerings, and new offerings include things like Chess, SWAT, Math Club, Intramural Track, Flag Football, and Basketball. OMS will also continue to offer a host of formal athletic programs. Last year, the school added Baseball for the first time. The school now offers seven (7) athletic opportunities.

Building in additional student, parent, and community member involvement in essential planning and decision-making will remain a goal this year that will be discussed at all pertinent functions enumerated herein. Research demonstrates positive effect sizes in terms of impacts on student learning when multiple stakeholders combine their efforts on behalf of school leadership and decision-making (see...Mulford, et al 2003, 2005, 2008). This has been identified by the GC at OMS as an essential component of successful school leadership for learning.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Some of the stakeholders have already been mentioned in part A above. A more complete list, along with their role(s) is shown below:

1. School Advisory Committee (SAC)-Provide advice and input to the Principal in developing school goals

and strategies per Florida law by actively reviewing surveys and other data provided by the Administration.

2. Parent & Family Engagement Committee (PFEC)-Provide advice and input to the AP/Title I Coordinator on the annual PFEP plan, based on the annual survey and other survey data collected at parent and family involvement events.

3. Guiding Coalition (GC)-acts as the primary instructional leadership team for OMS. Plans school-wide work related to instruction as the "nucleus" of the school's Professional Learning Community (PLC); supports Professional Learning Team (PLT) grade level and content area lead teachers. Responsible for implementation of "Learning by Doing" & model PLC / PLTs.

4. Professional Learning Team (PLT)-is the group/collection of PLT grade level and content area teams for ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies at OMS. This group provides oversight and continuity to instructional planning and response to instruction efforts at the school. They work with all other core area teachers to identify essential standards, create common formative assessments related to the essential standards, and processes to re-teach/re-assess or extend learning for all students.

5. OMS Leadership Team-comprised of administrators and academic coaches, this group provides support to other key stakeholder groups, resourcing them with time, materials, etc to ensure the structure and opportunity exists for the essential work of the school to happen. Ensures that school decision-making is truly "shared," placing value on critical dialogue via conversations that honor and involve key individuals such as teachers and students in the leadership of the school (see...Freire, 1987, 1995, 2015). This team also provides direct instructional support via classroom walkthroughs, informal and formal observations & feedback (all teachers), and instructional coaching cycles for new or newer teachers.

6. Positive Behavior Intervention & Support (PBIS) Committee-Reviews data on student behavior on a regular basis and provides input to planning and programming for all tier levels in the school. Hosts fundraisers and events in order to make student incentives and rewards possible.

7. OMS Safety Committee (SC)-Reviews workplace employee and student injury data, and provides oversight and advice on such matters. Assists the administration in the conduct of all safety-related activities in the school, including lockdown procedures, campus searches, fire drills, bomb threat drills, severe weather preparation, shelter management, evacuation plans, etc.

8. OMS Crime Watch/Project SAVE Club-Affiliated with Sandy Hook Promise, this group plans positive school events such as Start With Hello and See Something/Say Something. Assists the AP, Dean, and SRO with monitoring and reporting potentially dangerous or harmful circumstances, conducting required drills, and hosts visiting student or guest tours of the building as needed.

Beyond formal committees doing important work, our teachers, parents, volunteers and students are all considered critical stakeholders in what constitutes the OMS "TEAM!"