

School District of Osceola County, FL

Kissimmee Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Kissimmee Middle School

2410 DYER BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34741

www.osceolaschools.net

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.

We will become a community of professionals who collectively and collaboratively create relevant, rigorous learning experiences for all students while building positive relationships with them.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will be emotionally, socially, and academically prepared for COLLEGE and CAREER beyond high school.

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
Machado, Monique	Principal	As the instructional Leader of Kissimmee Middle School, Ms. Machado's responsibility is to create a safe, student-centered, learning environments that maximizes student academic achievement and socio-emotional well-being. Ms. Machado supervises the design of the master schedule, hires and evaluates instructional personnel, and works closely with instructional coaches and mentors to ensure students receive high quality instruction that is adequate for their needs. She is also responsible for Research, Evaluation and Accountability.
Melvin, Michael	Assistant Principal	Mr. Melvin is responsible for oversight of school facilities, safety, technology, and assessment. He is the contact administrator for Panorama Surveys, and compliance with SAC and Title I. As an instructional leader, Mr. Melvin promotes and evaluates teacher effectiveness together with the Principal and other Assistant Principals. He oversees the English Language Arts Department and is responsible for ongoing progress monitoring of Lexile scores using Achieve3000 TeenBiz.
Collin, Amy	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Collin is the Assistant Principal for Instruction responsible for building and maintaining the school's master schedule. She is also the administrator contact for Professional Learning Communities, AVID, and Stocktake. The Stocktake process allows the school leadership team to design action steps to accomplish the school improvement plan and monitor the effectiveness of implementation. This year, Mrs. Collin will work closely with Social Studies, and ongoing progress monitoring of Civics. As an instructional leader, Mrs. Collin promotes and evaluates teacher effectiveness together with the Principal and other Assistant Principals.
Davis, Karen	Reading Coach	Coach and Mentor Language Arts and Reading Teachers - Develop and implement Schoolwide Literacy Plan.
Western, Brandon	Assistant Principal	Mr. Western is responsible for student discipline and attendance and promoting a positive learning environment through PBIS initiative. As an instructional leader, Mr. Western promotes and evaluates teacher effectiveness together with the Principal and other Assistant Principals.
Demmitt, Becky	Other	
Narine, Virnell	Dean	Dean & PBIS Coach
Sypolt, Joseph	Other	
Weil, Joshua	Math Coach	Math & Science Coach. Mr. Weil supports math and science teachers in lesson planning and implementation, assessment, and progress monitoring. He is also a

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	----------------	---------------------------------

member of the MTSS Team, addressing students' needs, from remediation to acceleration during WIN and instructional time.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The leadership team reached out to instructional coaches and teacher leaders to begin drafting the School Improvement Plan. Parents, students, and community members are involved in the process through the School Advisory Council (SAC). Ms. Machado presented student data and draft to SAC members and provides translation to ensure all members' input is used to finalize the plan.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP is monitored formally on a monthly basis, through the StockTake process, when student progress monitoring data are reviewed, and action steps are determined based on likelihood of success of the plan. This means steps may change or remain the same.

Demographic Data

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	92%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: C
	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	2017-18: C
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	0	78	68	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	86	72	172
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	22
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	191	225	195	611
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	204	193	131	528
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	170	222	174	566

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	100	98	115	313
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	85	88	200
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	145	163	473
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	186	156	156	498
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	57	78	190

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	135	124	114	373

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	29	35	35	99

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	100	98	115	313
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	85	88	200
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	145	163	473
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	186	156	156	498
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	57	78	190

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	135	124	114	373

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	35	35	99

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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	32	44	50	37	45	54
ELA Learning Gains	43	46	48	46	48	54
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38	36	38	47	42	47
Math Achievement*	33	44	54	41	49	58
Math Learning Gains	50	54	58	52	51	57
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55	58	55	57	47	51
Science Achievement*	32	49	49	39	47	51
Social Studies Achievement*	56	68	71	70	72	72
Middle School Acceleration	83			88		
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	45			42		

* 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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	467
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**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	31	Yes	3	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	64			
BLK	44			
HSP	46			
MUL	37	Yes	2	
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	43			

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)

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	32	43	38	33	50	55	32	56	83			45

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
SWD	22	39	31	22	48	43	18	31				23
ELL	28	41	36	29	48	53	23	46	81			45
AMI												
ASN	45	50		66	80		50	92				
BLK	30	44	40	29	48	63	36	58				
HSP	31	42	37	32	49	55	30	52	84			45
MUL	24	50		24	50							
PAC												
WHT	42	47	46	40	53	50	33	70	85			
FRL	28	40	37	29	46	53	29	55	80			37

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	32	43	43	29	35	39	33	62	82			41
SWD	22	39	31	21	33	31	21	33				17
ELL	22	42	46	22	36	42	22	51	86			41
AMI												
ASN	53	68		55	50		60					
BLK	34	37	43	26	32	36	23	65	64			
HSP	30	43	44	27	35	38	32	59	82			41
MUL	20	31		16	47							
PAC												
WHT	40	45	29	43	34	39	41	79	89			46
FRL	28	39	37	25	32	34	31	57	83			30

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	37	46	47	41	52	57	39	70	88			42
SWD	28	42	35	32	52	49	16	41				23
ELL	25	43	45	29	53	60	22	59	81			42
AMI												

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
ASN	72	47		67	59							
BLK	40	48	43	39	45	39	43	65	95			
HSP	34	45	49	41	53	58	38	70	86			42
MUL	29	33		23	21							
PAC												
WHT	46	51	44	46	53	64	38	72	88			
FRL	33	43	44	38	51	56	34	69	88			39

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	21%	39%	-18%	47%	-26%
08	2023 - Spring	21%	40%	-19%	47%	-26%
06	2023 - Spring	15%	39%	-24%	47%	-32%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	12%	40%	-28%	54%	-42%
07	2023 - Spring	28%	39%	-11%	48%	-20%
08	2023 - Spring	25%	48%	-23%	55%	-30%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	17%	35%	-18%	44%	-27%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	40%	42%	50%	32%

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	98%	65%	33%	63%	35%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	42%	63%	-21%	66%	-24%

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 which showed the lowest performance in the most recent data reviewed (2022-2023) was Science, 17% of students demonstrated proficiency. The results can be associated to a variety of factors, including student and staff attendance, students' limited English proficiency, and high percentage of new teachers with limited experience in standards-based instruction.

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

Several data components showed great decline from the prior year. Science proficiency showed the greatest decline -15% - (32% to 17%). Factors contributing to this decline include staff turnover, high percentage of new teachers with limited experience in Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (FCAT 2.0).

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 had the greatest gap when compared to the state average (KMS 21% vs State of FL 53%). Factors that contributed to this gap include student and staff attendance, students' limited English proficiency, high percentage of new teachers with limited experience in standards-based instruction, attendance matters related to tardies and skipping.

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

Biology data showed improvement, from 95% to 98%. Targeted intervention was used to ensure all students would be proficient.

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

Low proficiency rates in all areas except academic acceleration; attendance (including unexcused absences, tardies and skipping) and One or More out-of-school suspensions.

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

- Improving performance of ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities.
- Providing a positive culture and environment specifically relating to Early Warning System.
- Improving instructional practice specifically relating to Student Engagement.
- Improving instructional practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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 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.

For the last 3 years, students with disabilities students have earned below the required federal index of 41%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

KMS will increase the federal index points for SWD to 41% on the PM3 FAST test in both ELA and Math.

Monitoring:

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

Student growth and progress will be monitored quarterly on the STAR and PM1, PM2 FAST exams

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Collin (amy.collin@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.)

Instruction of students with disabilities will be in the general education setting, as outlined in their respective IEP's, using inclusive practices and student-centered collaborative structures. Instructional research-based practices including Universal Design for Learning (UDL), Response to Intervention (RtI), Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS), and Assistive Technology (AT) will be applied.

UDL

<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/rel/Products/Region/northwest/Ask-A-REL/60018>

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

-Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is a framework to improve and optimize teaching and learning for all learners based on scientific insights into how humans learn.

-Response to Intervention (RTI) is a system of supports that schools put in place to provide high-quality education to students who are having difficulty with academics or behavior, for example small group instruction during intervention time.

-Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and improve student outcomes every day. PBIS creates schools where all students succeed, including students with disabilities.

-Assistive Technology can help students with disabilities learn and think differently work around their challenges, for example an app that reads text aloud.

All these research-based practices, combined, increase the likelihood of success of students.

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.

Professional Development for Core Content Teachers regarding implementing classroom interventions, as directed by student IEPs.

Person Responsible: Becky Demmitt (becky.demmitt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 13, 2023

Teachers will plan for differentiations for students with IEPs, as appropriate for their goals or accommodations.

Person Responsible: Amy Collin (amy.collin@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Each month, a review of lesson plans will be shared at the StockTake meeting and a Needs Assessment completed for needed Professional Development or Coaching

Mentor Teachers will be trained in best practices for Support Facilitation services and coach their assigned teachers in implementing these practices, these include collaborative teaching and Universal Design for Learning.

Person Responsible: Romanita Roman (ramonita.roman@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Training for Coaches will happen by August 21, 2023. The coaches will report monthly about their support and observations of differentiations in classrooms.

Students with disabilities will be purposefully supported during WIN interventions to best meet their needs in subject area groups.

Person Responsible: Becky Demmitt (becky.demmitt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

Formative Assessment data, PLT and/or district created, will be analyzed for how students with disabilities are performing compared to their peers. Interventions to regular classroom instruction will occur to meet their needs.

Person Responsible: Joseph Sypolt (joseph.sypolt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly lesson plan and PLT participation reviews

Learning Strategies teachers will implement Osceola Numeracy project in the Learning Strategies class

Person Responsible: Joshua Weil (joshua.weil@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Ongoing. Monthly check in on FOCUS gradebook.

#2. 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.

Kissimmee Middle School will continue to build on the foundation of PBIS vs. exclusionary discipline practices for non SESIR incidents. Utilizing 2022-2023 discipline data, there were 892 incidents (50% of student body) with resultant consequence listed as "loss of lunch privilege". This equates to a supervised lunch whereby students enjoy their lunch in a restricted area, with one of the deans.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Kissimmee Middle School will reduce the percent of students in lunch detention by 10%. The number of students receiving lunch detention will be 40% of student body or less. Using current enrollment of 1,312 students, that's no more than 525 incidents of lunch detention this year.

Monitoring:

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

Each month the Behavior MTSS team will gather the numbers of lunch detentions, recorded on FOCUS the SIS and track progress towards the goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brandon Western (brandon.western@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.)

PBIS Implementation School-wide. The school has an internal currency known as "Jags". Students who follow behavior expectations throughout the day, earn Jags. These Jags can be used at the Jag store for sweets and treats of their choice, 2x a week. Jags can also be used for admission to schoolwide events such a Friday dress-down, lunch outside, Crocs day etc.

<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/study/78551>

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research indicates that consistent implementation PBIS strategies improve student success as they spend more time making positive behavior choices. Kissimmee Middle School will lean on consistent expectations, proactive encouragement of positive behaviors, and targeted supports to increase the recurrence of positive choices while decreasing the incidence of negative behavior infractions.

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.

Teach new staff the basic fundamentals of PBIS and Best Practices in creating a Positive Classroom Community. The goal is to alter school environments by creating improved systems and procedures that promote positive change in student behavior by targeting staff behavior.

Person Responsible: Monique Machado (monique.machado@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Ongoing, monthly Stocktake to track incrementation toward desired goal.

Students identified by previous year of school's EWS, are invited to individual parent meetings to ensure all Parent-to-School supports are in place. Monthly parent outreach by counselors. Parent-School meetings scheduled on a monthly basis to ensure contact with all EWS.

Person Responsible: Ata Valles (atabex.vallessanchez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: By November 17, 2023

Consistent messaging throughout campus with explicit Jaguar student expectations. What do these expectations look like in the hallway, in the lunch room, in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Virnell Narine (virnell.narine@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Weekly observation check of: Morning procedures, lunch procedures, dismissal procedures, transitions and referrals regarding students not following procedures.

Consistent implementation of discipline matrix and interventions regarding students skipping classes

Person Responsible: Brandon Western (brandon.western@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Weekly check with a monthly report at the Stocktake meeting regarding number of students earning referrals for skipping or out of area.

Faculty wide Book Study: What Great Teachers Do Differently

Person Responsible: Amy Collin (amy.collin@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly discourse and quick tips included in the bi-weekly staff newsletter.

Students identified by early warning systems in 2 or more areas or recommended by staff will participate in targeted learning opportunities in WIN and invited to free tutoring offered daily.

Person Responsible: Joseph Sypolt (joseph.sypolt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

Guest Speakers from the community will be organized for targeted reentry groups following OSS.

Person Responsible: Ata Valles (atabex.vallessanchez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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.

Low proficiency rates across the board, in ELA (19%), Math (21%), Science (17%), and Civics (42%), indicate a dire need to improve instructional practices. Student engagement has the potential of improving outcomes in all areas, when combined with rigorous tasks aligned to standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

KMS expects to meet the state averages for each area: ELA (47%), Math (53%), Science (44%), Civics (65%) and MUL (41%).

Monitoring:

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

Each week, mentors, coaches and the administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs using NEST tool and look for purposefully planned engagement strategies applied to tasks aligned to standards, and the level of student engagement. This will be shared at MTSS meetings and Monthly Stocktake reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Collin (amy.collin@osceolaschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Kagan Cooperative Learning Practices

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Numerous studies have shown that purposeful highly-structured cooperative learning strategies help students engage and process the content more efficiently and effectively. Students also increase their time on task in the content and have higher learning gains overall.

<https://www.proquest.com/openview/6152c1ba671ece5fe90512254e3e3aef/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750>

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.

Model highly-structured cooperative learning structures in faculty, PLT and professional development as focused by quarterly district guides. Support and celebrate with specific examples in Bi-weekly newsletter

Person Responsible: Amy Collin (amy.collin@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Weekly/Bi-weekly

Math & Science Teachers are supported in implementing purposeful engagement strategies in each lesson.

Person Responsible: Joshua Weil (joshua.weil@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly deliverable of walk-through data, using NEST tool, PLT agendas, ALEKS reports and coaching plans.

ELA & Reading Teachers are supported in implementing purposeful engagement strategies in each lesson.

Person Responsible: Michael Melvin (michael.melvin@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly deliverable of walk-through data, using NEST tool, PLT agendas, Achieve3000 Lexile score tracking, check for understanding data for MUL students and coaching plans from District resource teachers..

Social Studies Teachers are supported in implementing purposeful engagement strategies in each lesson.

Person Responsible: Joseph Sypolt (joseph.sypolt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly deliverable of walk-through data, using NEST tool, PLT agendas, Progress learning green dot challenge for MUL students and coaching plans.

Self monitoring and goal setting. Students will track their progress on various learning management systems, and compare their performance to preset levels associated with each performance band of the FAST (1-5).

MUL students will meet with counselors quarterly to review academics and track progress toward preset academic goals.

https://www.visiblelearningmetax.com/influences/view/self_monitoring

Person Responsible: Ata Valles (atabex.vallessanchez@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly/Quarterly

#4. 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.

Low proficiency rates across the board, in ELA (19%), Math (21%), Science (17%), and Civics (42%), indicate a dire need to improve instructional practices. Rigorous tasks aligned to on-grade level standards provide students with adequate experiences to engage in higher-order thinking and be better prepared to perform in high-stakes assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

KMS expects to meet the state averages for each area: ELA (47%), Math (53%), Science (44%), and Civics (65%).

Monitoring:

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

Each week, mentors, coaches and the administrators will conduct classroom walkthroughs using the NEST tool and look for purposefully planned engagement strategies applied to tasks aligned to standards, and the level of student engagement.

Formative Assessments, as well as district guided assessments, will be administered to monitor student progress on the standards.

Data will be shared at MTSS meetings and Monthly Stocktake reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joseph Sypolt (joseph.sypolt@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.)

Task-alignment is supported by the Backward Design (Wiggins and McTighe). "Our lessons, units, and courses should be logically inferred from the results sought, not derived from the methods, books, and activities with which we are most comfortable. Curriculum should lay out the most effective ways of achieving specific results... in short, the best designs derive backward from the learnings sought."

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Assessment drives instruction. When the alignment among summative assessment, learning goals, formative assessment, and teaching strategies/scaffolds is adequate, students engage in higher-order thinking on a regular basis and are more likely to tackle a high-stakes assessment with the same level of complexity.

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.

Professional Development for what standards aligned instruction looks like and how to plan for standards-aligned instruction.

Person Responsible: Michael Melvin (michael.melvin@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly review and feedback provided to teachers and/or PLTs

Staff will participate in coaching, modeling cycles, peer-to-peer observations and planning conferences based on needs.

Person Responsible: Amy Collin (amy.collin@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Teachers will be meet with coaches and administrators quarterly, and participate in at least one of the following coaching methods: one-to-one coaching, modeling cycle, peer-to-peer observation, or planning conference.

Staff will participate in PLTs to plan how to build activities that are aligned to the standards using strategies from Carnegie Learning.

Person Responsible: Joshua Weil (joshua.weil@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Staff will use formative assessments, PLT or District created/assigned, to monitor student growth and identify student needs.

Person Responsible: Joseph Sypolt (joseph.sypolt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly data collection for Stocktake

Students will participate in Tier 1, 2 and 3 level interventions during classtime and WIN period.

Person Responsible: Joseph Sypolt (joseph.sypolt@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Quarterly assignments

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).

District personnel perform learning walks several times a year to identify Glow, Grows, and Next Steps. The district debriefs with school administration to design a prescribed plan of support, to ensure SWDs and MUL students are fully supported. Kissimmee Middle School will avail itself of all available District Resource personnel, and Title 1 funding to further support beginning teachers and improve Tier 1 instruction for all learners.

Using Title 1 funds, the school employed a (1) Math & Science instructional coach. This teaching and learning professional will perform weekly walkthroughs, and monitor data on NWEA, SchoolCity, and formative assessments using leaning on frequent District check-for-understandings. The coach will meet with administration on a monthly basis to review data, and next steps.

In addition, and using a concerted effort to target the academic achievement of ESSA subgroups (SWD's & MUL's) , two additional Math teachers were employed to deliver supplemental foundational math instruction to struggling Tier 2 learners.

In an effort to reinforce and augment a teacher's effort in the classroom, five Title 1 Paraprofessionals (5) were hired. These Paraprofessionals will (1)provide one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher, (2) assist with classroom management, such

as by organizing instructional materials, (3) provide instructional assistance in a computer laboratory, (4) conduct parental involvement activities, (5) provide instructional support in a library or media center, (6) act as a translator, or (7) provide instructional support services under the direct supervision of a highly qualified teacher. [Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

During the September 2023 SAC meeting, Kissimmee Middle School presented and discussed the SIP and the UniSIG budget with all stakeholders to gather feedback. Schools shared flyers with students and posted on the school website and social media at least seven days prior to the meeting in English and Spanish to announce and invite stakeholders to participate and provide input. The school also advertised the meeting on the school marquee, to invite stakeholders to the annual meeting. In addition, the school provided pizza, refreshments and translation services in Spanish, as well as the translation of other meeting documents like the agenda. The SIP and meeting documents will be disseminated in the school's website, social media, and a hardcopy will be available in the school's front office. The SIP's progress will be monitored during the December 2023 SAC meeting by sharing data to evaluate the progress of the plan and effectiveness of the activities to determine if an amendment is needed.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Kissimmee Middle School plans to create a positive culture with parents, families, and stakeholders by providing several meetings throughout the school year for families to be involved in the development of the school's Parent and Family Engagement (PFEP) plan, PFEP summary/brochure, school-parent compact and use of PFEP funds for improved academic achievement. The PFEP documentation will be made available in both English and Spanish at the school as well as on the website. Notifications will be disbursed from the school through automated/reminder calls, flyers, and invitations, School Advisory Committee (SAC) meetings, Parent-Teacher meetings, social media, and website. Building Capacity events will be held throughout the year inviting families to participate in learning activities specific to academic goals.

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

Kissimmee Middle School will implement Kagan Collaborative Learning strategies to foster positive culture and environment by cultivating and stimulating positive relationships, equal participation, and active student interaction to increase student achievements by ten percent as indicated by the FAST, decrease behavior incidents by ten percent, and decrease absenteeism by five percent. Teachers will participate in Collaborative learning strategies in group meetings and learn how to implement them in their classrooms. Teacher mentors will coach and model these as well to increase engagement, communication skills, peer collaboration and academic thinking.

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

Kissimmee Middle School coordinates the development of the School Improvement Plan alongside several federal, state and local services, such as: Title I, Part A for the implementation of supplemental education for disadvantaged students, Title II, Part A for the implementation of various Professional Development opportunities to support teacher growth; Title III for the implementation of Multicultural services; Title IV, Part A for the implementation of student enrichment activities; Title IX for the implementation and support of students and families in transition; and Perkins Career and TEchnical Education for the implementation of postsecondary opportunities and experiences.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

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

The school currently leans on four school counselors to support school-based mental health services. Counselors host group sessions, one-on-one sessions, provide academic guidance, and support the OSS reentry program, to avoid recidivism.

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

School Counselors support preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities via Xello. The school offer AVID as well to engage students and help them plan for high school and beyond.

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

MTSS for behavior is used to track behavioral infractions. Student data is discussed at the weekly leadership meeting to gauge how well students are responding to Tier 1 interventions. KMS tracks SWDs, MUL, and all ESSA subgroups closely to ensure they're not being disproportionately disciplined.

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

Ongoing progress monitoring is evident at all levels for both students, and staff. Teachers, and consistently offered curriculum and instruction supports designed to improve instructional delivery and student engagement. Support comes in the form of District Resource Teachers, Academic Coaches, Administrators, and Colleagues via PLT meetings. In addition, Mathematics receives ongoing support from Carnegie Math consultants who provide a suite of non-evaluative support services on-site each month. Carnegie provides help with lesson planning, instructional delivery, student engagement, classroom management, manipulative use etc., The District earmarks specific days for ongoing professional development for both teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel. Staff members select the session/s of choice to ensure they are in control of their professional growth and development.

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

N/A