Osceola Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* 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

The faculty and staff of Osceola Middle School will provide an engaging, rigorous learning environment that is meaningful to middle school students. We will strive to equip students with the skills necessary to be college or career ready, and contribute as members of a global society in the 21st century.

Provide the school's vision statement

Exceeding Expectations!

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Nielson, Taylor	Guidance Counselor	
Maggard, Sara	Guidance Counselor	
Downing, Sean	Principal	
Potter, Greg	Assistant Principal	
Smith, Sonya	Instructional Coach	
Tomlinson, LaRenda	Instructional Coach	
Kellner, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	
Talavera, Jessica	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2010, Sean Downing

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*
10

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*
15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by 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	231	281	216	0	0	0	0	728
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	26	29	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	52	42	0	0	0	0	120
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	28	4	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	37	10	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	69	78	0	0	0	0	214
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	47	35	0	0	0	0	133

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	31	50	36	0	0	0	0	117

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/25/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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	285	235	238	0	0	0	0	758
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	47	53	0	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	31	58	0	0	0	0	130
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	38	13	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	92	87	0	0	0	0	257

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	48	54	53	0	0	0	0	155

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	7	10	7	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4	0	0	0	0	19

Prior Year - Updated

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	285	235	238	0	0	0	0	758
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	47	53	0	0	0	0	147
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	31	58	0	0	0	0	130
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	38	13	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	92	87	0	0	0	0	257

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	48	54	53	0	0	0	0	155

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	7	10	7	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4	0	0	0	0	19

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	44%	42%	54%	41%	40%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	48%	54%	47%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	43%	47%	39%	44%	47%
Math Achievement	63%	61%	58%	62%	58%	58%
Math Learning Gains	59%	60%	57%	69%	67%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	56%	51%	59%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	43%	51%	40%	39%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	69%	60%	72%	65%	55%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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	2019	46%	47%	-1%	54%	-8%
	2018	44%	41%	3%	52%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	43%	38%	5%	52%	-9%
	2018	33%	32%	1%	51%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	39%	37%	2%	56%	-17%
	2018	41%	40%	1%	58%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	59%	54%	5%	55%	4%
	2018	66%	56%	10%	52%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	57%	55%	2%	54%	3%
	2018	43%	46%	-3%	54%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
08	2019	58%	51%	7%	46%	12%
	2018	67%	54%	13%	45%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	48%	41%	7%	48%	0%
	2018	40%	37%	3%	50%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	69%	59%	10%	71%	-2%
2018	62%	50%	12%	71%	-9%
Compare		7%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	90%	52%	38%	61%	29%
2018	100%	54%	46%	62%	38%
Compare		-10%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	47%	53%	57%	43%
2018	100%	44%	56%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	14	37	36	33	48	46	17	33			
ELL	30	44	58	54	55	44	32	48	27		

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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		

2018 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	14	28	28	33	52	49	13	40			
ELL	23	40	41	50	62	62	12	68			
BLK	24	41	42	50	69	62	14	43			
HSP	39	48	37	62	67	57	36	67	67		
MUL	25	47		56	44						
WHT	45	48	40	65	72	60	48	64	61		
FRL	36	46	41	60	67	58	38	62	59		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	35
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	534
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43

English Language Learners	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	47
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	59
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	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

ESE: We have not seen consistent performance with regards to this population. We have continued to change staff and have struggled with both our resource student performance and our inclusion students. We thought we looked good at the point of shutdown in the spring, however now we will have to monitor this closely to ensure we didn't experience summer slide due to COVID.

ELA Proficiency-LG-BQLG: See comments below in section II.C and III.

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

When examining the cohort comparisons, we have seen a decline in seventh grade (ELA and math). We also saw a decline in Algebra 1 (acceleration course) due to a change in staffing.

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

ELA Acheivement remains our largest gap with the state. The scores have been following a positive trend since we allocated a block to ELA, and at the time of shutdown last spring we were projecting to be on target for 50% achievement. We have focused our presechool PD on a balanced literacy block and have been working last year and this on providing targeted intervention (people) on our most at-risk populations (ESE, BQ, etc.).

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

We saw the biggest improvement in the area of Science Acheivement. We had a large jump due to new staff teaching the content. We hope to build on that performance in the new year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Areas of concern from EWS traditionally is attendance, which is made more difficult in the era of COVID. This year we are focusing on our level 1s using targeted intervention (most likely our BQ students) and also course failure.

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

1. Eliminate ESSA deficiency with ESE.
2. Contine to focus on the performance of the students identified in lowest 30% (bottom quartile).
3. Monitor the performance of ELL and African American subgroups on diagnostic and common unit assessments.
4. We want to continue to show year-over-year growth in all proficiency and learning gains (all areas applicable).
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We have experienced a lot of change over the years and we recognize if we have structures in place and correctly indoctrinate our new-hires that we are able to sustain improvement despite the changes. This has been accomplished through our various APs, counselors and instructional coaches over the last 10 years. Similarly, as we have experienced staffing changes in core content areas, we train them and ensure that we provide feedback to improve instructional practice. If we as a leadership team are able to provide coordinated feedback to teachers, we expect that student outcomes will continue to improve.
Measureable Outcome:	We hope to see improvement on the walk-throughs performed in our core content areas (using the Instructional Practice Guide).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Coaches and administrators routinely use the Instructional Practice Guide to walk through classrooms independently, with third party contractors (Instruction Partners), as a leadership team, or with Instructional Coaches/ Admin from other school sites.
	Based on the data we collect, we set goals as departments that relate improved instructional practice to improved student achievement. This departmental goal is then used as a base for individual teacher professional development plans (Deliberate Practice Plans or DPPs).
	Content-specific feedback is critical to teacher professional development. The Instructional Practice Guide (IPG) is a K–12 classroom observation rubric that prioritizes what is observable in and expected of classroom instruction when instructional content is aligned to college- and career-ready (CCR) standards, including Florida Standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Systemic improvement must be well-thought out and routinely monitored for effectiveness. The IPG and our work as a leadership team around our OMS definition of quality instruction have helped us sustain improvements at the teacher, grade and school level over multiple years, despite the changes we have faced in a somewhat transitory teacher population.

Action Steps to Implement

Conduct walk-throughs using the instructional practice guide.

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

Collect and review the IPG data at the grade and department level.

Person Responsible	Sonya Smith (sonya.smith@okee.k12.fl.us)

Report out findings as appropriate and use results to judge effectiveness of strategy (for the purposes of goal-setting 2021-2022).

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We were identified as being in need of improvement related to our student performance as it relates to students with disabilities (proficiency). We have not seen a sustained, consistent improvement in this area from 2018-present. We recognize that SWD need more access to rigorous coursework and increased levels of intervention to support that work. At the point where we shut down last spring, we were in our second cycle of intervention support for students with disabilities and students in the lowest 30% (bottom quartile).

The OMS Administrative Team has also been monitoring the performance of ELL, African American student performance in the core content areas. These subgroups, while not identified by ESSA, continue to be monitored to ensure they are also receiving appropriate instruction and instructional support/ intervention. |
Measureable Outcome:	Students with Disabilities will score above 41% on standardized tests.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sean Downing (downings@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We utilize an evidence-based decision-making cycle.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Much like a former practice (plan-do-check-act), we use timely data collection to make changes to the intervention as necessary to sustain improvement.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify students in need of intervention (particularly those who are in subgroups identified above).

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

Schedule time for interventions. Deliver targeted interventions. Administer regular (at least every 6-8 weeks) progress checks using NWEA. Judge effectiveness of interventions (based on NWEA, grades, CUA performance, etc.). Meet with teams to decide to vary the frequency, duration, and/or intensity of future interventions based on data. Implement further interventions. Re-evaluate and the cycle continues as we go throughout the year and as more data is available.

Person Responsible	LaRenda Tomlinson (tomlinsonl@okee.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The OMS faculty and staff realize we have several areas to work on as it pertains to Culture and Environment, including, but not limited to: Equity and Diversity, Discipline, Attendance and Social-Emotional Learning. Our current "vehicle" for addressing these issues is our PBIS Team. We will focus on PBIS and attenmpt to improve our culture and environment.
Measureable Outcome:	Lower the percentage of referrals by demographic/sub-categories. (Special populations: ESE, Gender, Ethnicity, etc.)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Taylor Nielson (taylor.nielson@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We utilize an evidence-based decision-making cycle.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Much like a former practice (plan-do-check-act), we use timely data collection to make changes to the intervention as necessary to sustain improvement. We have seen success in decreasaing the numbers of ODRs, out-of-school suspensions. We need to continue to sustain these improvements.

Action Steps to Implement

Set goals for the current year through OMS PBIS Team. Monitor data and report out monthly.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Year-over-year growth: The OMS Leadership Team feels if we can implement the three Areas of Focus listed above, we will still achieve year-over-year growth.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The teachers and staff use broad outreach to ensure meaningful stakeholder engagement. We utilize social media in order to try and tell our story. We annually host a Community Day and a School Improvement Presentation Day with our local school board. During these events we share our data, our current plans, and utilize classroom walk-throughs. We leverage several agencies to provide mental health and behavioral health services for tier 1-3 students. We frequently survey our students, faculty and parents to get feedback on our healthy culture. We report out our data with our stakeholder groups to make sure that they continue to spread the good word and work of Osceola Middle School.

Several challenges exist. Since we have experienced the shutdown, we must see how our parent and community outreach experiences will change. There has also been a seismic shift in the social justice landscape following the #BLM movement, and we as an entity need to reflect these changes in mentality. Additionally, we are focused on employing more aspects of restorative discipline/justice with our students. This had been a priority for the year prior to the reopening school safety plans which have now taken more attention at least at the outset of the school year.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00