

School District of Osceola County, FL

# Horizon Middle School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>24</b>

# Horizon Middle School

2020 HAM BROWN RD, Kissimmee, FL 34746

www.osceolaschools.net

## Demographics

**Principal: Michael Ballone**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students <b>Students With Disabilities</b> White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (56%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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 Osceola 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](http://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**

Horizon Middle School strives to develop self- confident and creative students willing to take risks within a challenging and innovative environment.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement**

Horizon Middle School is committed to preparing ALL students to be college and career ready.

### 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
Ballone, Michael	Principal	Instructional leader - Leads the shared decision-making process along with the administrative team and the school's leadership team to address data, interventions, and school-based decisions. Promotes a schoolwide culture of learning through the PLC and the MTSS processes..
Casado, Rolando	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader - Participates in the shared decision-making process along with the administrative team and the school's leadership team to address data, interventions, and school-based decisions. Develops and Manages the school master schedule. Responsible for conducting monthly Stocktake meetings to monitor the progress of the school improvement plan.
Lovegrove, Alexandra	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach and classroom interventionist - provide small group intervention and instruction coaching support. Push-in instructional support.
Lowe, Ashley	Dean	Provide behavioral support and campus supervision. Participate in the collection of behavior data and managing interventions.
Granger, Richard	Dean	Provide behavioral support and campus supervision. Participate in the collection of behavior data and managing interventions.
Hinds, Jacqueline	Instructional Coach	Literacy coach - provide small group intervention and instruction coaching support.
Anakotta, Keith	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader - Participates in the shared decision-making process along with the administrative team and the school's leadership team to address data, interventions, and school-based decisions. Leads the school wide PBIS process and he is the administrator overseeing testing.
Hiltunen, Catherine	Instructional Coach	Math/Science coach - provide small group intervention and instruction coaching support.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Michael Ballone

**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.*

6

**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.*

55

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

92

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (56%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

\* 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	129	211	227	0	0	0	0	567
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	34	41	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	19	38	0	0	0	0	88
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	69	135	0	0	0	277
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	34	73	0	0	0	147

#### 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	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

#### 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	6	4	12	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/9/2020

### 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	410	450	458	0	0	0	0	1318
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	21	30	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	77	93	0	0	0	0	241

**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	47	44	47	0	0	0	0	138

**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	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	410	450	458	0	0	0	0	1318
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	21	30	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	77	93	0	0	0	0	241

**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	47	44	47	0	0	0	0	138

**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	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## 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	47%	45%	54%	47%	47%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	48%	54%	53%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	42%	47%	45%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	53%	49%	58%	49%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains	57%	51%	57%	58%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	47%	51%	56%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	47%	51%	50%	48%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	72%	72%	75%	75%	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	45%	48%	-3%	54%	-9%
	2018	41%	46%	-5%	52%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	44%	47%	-3%	52%	-8%
	2018	38%	46%	-8%	51%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	44%	49%	-5%	56%	-12%
	2018	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2019	47%	45%	2%	55%	-8%
	2018	42%	43%	-1%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	26%	30%	-4%	54%	-28%
	2018	18%	29%	-11%	54%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
08	2019	54%	47%	7%	46%	8%
	2018	44%	43%	1%	45%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		36%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
08	2019	43%	42%	1%	48%	-5%
	2018	42%	42%	0%	50%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	98%	62%	36%	67%	31%
2018	100%	68%	32%	65%	35%
Compare		-2%			
<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	73%	73%	0%	71%	2%
2018	71%	70%	1%	71%	0%
Compare		2%			
<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	84%	49%	35%	61%	23%
2018	86%	52%	34%	62%	24%
Compare		-2%			
<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	97%	44%	53%	57%	40%
2018	100%	39%	61%	56%	44%
Compare		-3%			

**Subgroup Data**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	26	38	31	29	48	44	14	41			
ELL	31	42	35	36	54	67	21	51	63		
ASN	71	69		73	59		65	86	85		
BLK	39	42	37	49	54	41	43	68	82		
HSP	45	50	35	49	57	62	43	71	71		
MUL	46	42		50	63		44	77	90		
WHT	55	56	39	63	61	53	70	84	89		
FRL	41	47	34	49	57	55	41	69	69		

<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
SWD	18	39	33	22	49	45	19	32			
ELL	20	42	38	26	56	56	17	40	82		
ASN	70	58		74	76		64	92	100		
BLK	44	46	47	43	57	64	46	80	81		
HSP	45	54	44	46	57	57	46	72	81		
MUL	41	54		38	32		38	45			
WHT	54	56	45	58	60	46	66	80	81		
FRL	44	54	45	46	57	49	45	70	79		

**ESSA Data**

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	547
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
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
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	73
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	59
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	63
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

## 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**

ELA lowest quartile learning gains was the area that showed the lowest performance. Contributing factors included: Poor school attendance and the

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

ELA lowest quartile learning gains component showed the greatest decline from prior year. Contributing factors Lack of implementation of research-based engaging strategies for low performing students. Another contributing factor was teacher the lack of effective monitoring for learning.

#### **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 lowest quartile component showed the largest gap as compared to state average.

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

ELA proficiency for students with disabilities and for English language learners subgroups showed the largest improvement. The school actions included scheduling ESOL Para-professionals in the ELA classrooms with the highest number of ELLs students. SWDs receive support services in the intensive reading classes. Students in both subgroups receive intervention services that help closing achievement gaps in learning.

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

The number students scoring a 1 in either ELA or Math FSA. We will also look closely at students with more than one EWS indicator as opportunities to intervene early on the school year.

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

1. Ensure high levels of learning for all students in literacy
2. Ensure high levels of mathematics achievement for all students
3. Ensure high levels of science achievement for all students
4. Increase achievement levels of all ESE and ELL student Subgroups
5. Develop a College and Career schoolwide Culture
6. Develop Social-Emotional Learning competence and Safe and Positive environment for ALL (Students and Staff).

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Improve Tier I instruction in English Language Arts (ELA). Implementation of Marzano's teaching map cycle: Standards-Based Planning, Standard-Based Instruction, and Conditions of Learning. PLCs data analysis of common assessments will provide guidance and support for students in Tier 2 and 3 (Dufour, 2010; Marzano, 2003).

**Measurable Outcome:** ELA proficiency will increase from 47% to 52% in the 2021 FSA.  
Increase ELA Learning Gains from 51% to 55% in the 2021 FSA.  
Increase the lowest 25% ELA Learning Gains from 36% to 50% in the 2021 FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. PLC from each grade level will unpack essential standards and identify learning targets that most closely address the standards (Dufour, 2010)
2. Use NWEA data to develop instructional plans for interventions during Tier 1 instruction (Wise & kuhfeld, 2020)
3. Make Read, Talk, Write, Solve practices more evident in classes.
4. Utilize research-based practices/strategies to deliver Tier 1 instruction (Marzano, 2003)
5. The Stocktake process will take place monthly to assess progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Unpacking standards and ID targets- provides clarity for students and teachers
2. Analyze students' quantitative and qualitative data- to determine specific learning needs of students; develop instructional plan to meet needs; and evaluate effectiveness of the instruction students receive (Where are we now?)
3. Marzano Instructional Strategies- great effect size, has positive impact on students' learning where utilized
4. Reading - Writing - Talking - Solving strategies to fully engage students while processing curriculum content
5. Instructional Coaching-.help teachers develop repertoire of strategies to deliver effective Tier 1 instruction

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. PLC teams move towards stage six of the PLC process.
2. Conduct Lesson Study with PLC teams
3. Monitor READ, WRITE, TALK, SOLVE strategies
4. Utilize research-based strategies to deliver high-quality Tier 1 instruction and monitor for learning
5. Use school-wide rubric for assessing the writing process
5. Use NWEA data to develop instructional plans for interventions during Tier 1 instruction.
6. Execute PDs and coaching cycles based on data from classroom walk-throughs.
7. Stocktake meetings will monitor progress
8. Provide students with Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions based on gaps in phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary.
9. Implement ELL Taskforce
10. Implement ESE Taskforce.



11. SWD will receive grade-level instruction that is scaffolded to meet their needs.
12. Implement AVID strategies schoolwide.
13. Administrators and instructional coaches team will attend weekly PLC team meetings to build capacity, analyze data, and respond to students' learning.

**Person Responsible** Jacqueline Hinds (jacqueline.hinds@osceolaschools.net)

## #2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** In reviewing the Social Emotional Learning data collected through the Panorama Student survey 2019/2020, it was noticed that out of the students surveyed, 43% chose favorably to, "School Belonging; How much students feel that they are valued members of the school community." This area of focus has a significant impact on both student academic and behavioral success at Horizon Middle School. Identifying this critical component is critical in understanding our student body and culture of the school. With a better understanding of the school culture, students and staff have the necessary tools to increase his/her success.

**Measureable Outcome:** Increase students' sense of community belief and belonging in Horizon Middle School from 43% to 53% (10%) as shown in the panorama climate survey.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Georgina Baba (georgina.baba@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Deliver needs assessments to students, examine data around school belonging and which students do not feel connected to any adults at school.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** There is a positive correlation between a sense of belonging at school and improved academic achievement and discipline data. Aspects of a positive school climate will lead to a safer environment and stronger student/teacher or staff relationships that support learning (Gennari, Meloniuo, & Rizvi, 2017)

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaborate with teachers to connect with specific students an increase perception of belonging.
2. Deliver needs assessment again towards the end of the year to assess increase in school belonging.
3. Use lunchtime opportunities to establish a positive relationship with all students.
4. Teachers and staff will develop and foster a welcoming and a sense of belonging community in each classroom.
5. Teachers and staff will increase input and voice through planning and reflection activities.
6. Teacher will integrate SEL strategies into their curriculum, such as, self management, self confidence.self efficacy, and social awareness where applicable.
7. Select intervention groups for students with low levels of engagements

**Person Responsible** Heather Summers (heather.summers@osceolaschools.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Improve Tier I instruction in mathematics through the implementation of Marzano's teaching map cycle: Standards-Based Planning, Standard-Based Instruction, and Conditions of Learning. PLCs data analysis of common assessments will provide guidance and support for students in Tier 2 and 3 (Dufour, 2010; Marzano, 2017).
<b>Measureable Outcome:</b>	Increase achievement levels in mathematics from 53% to 58% Increase learning gains in mathematics from 57% to 62% Increase lowest quartile learning gains in mathematics from 58% to 63%
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Catherine Hiltunen (catherine.hiltunen@osceolaschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PLC from each grade level will unpack essential standards and identify learning targets that most closely address the standards. (Dufour, 2010)</li> <li>2. Use NWEA data to develop instructional plans for interventions during Tier 1 instruction (Wise &amp; kuhfeld, 2020).</li> <li>3. Make Read, Talk, Write, Solve practices more evident in classes.</li> <li>4. Utilize research-based practices/strategies to deliver Tier 1 instruction (Marzano, 2017)</li> <li>5. The Stocktake process will take place monthly to assess progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus</li> </ol>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unpacking standards and ID targets- provides clarity for students and teachers</li> <li>2. Analyze students' quantitative and qualitative data- to determine specific learning needs of students; develop instructional plan to meet needs; and evaluate effectiveness of the instruction students receive (Where are we now?)</li> <li>3. Marzano Instructional Strategies- great effect size, has positive impact on students' learning where utilized</li> <li>4. Reading - Writing - Talking - Solving strategies to fully engage students while processing curriculum content</li> <li>5. Instructional Coaching-.help teachers develop repertoire of strategies to deliver effective Tier 1 instruction</li> </ol>

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. PLC teams move towards stage six of the PLC process.
2. Use NWEA data to develop instructional plans for interventions during Tier 1 instruction.
3. Make Read, Talk, Write, Solve practices more evident in classes.
4. Utilize the Marzano Instructional Framework to deliver Tier 1 instruction
5. The Stocktake process will take place monthly to assess progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus
6. Develop a systematic coaching calendar
7. Students will be provided Tier 2 instruction based on grade-level standards and content using data,
8. Offer job-embedded professional development.
9. Implement ELL Taskforce
10. Implement ESE Taskforce.
11. SWD will receive grade-level instruction that is scaffolded to meet their needs.
12. Implement AVID strategies schoolwide.

13. Principal, APs and instructional coaches team will attend weekly PLC team meetings to build capacity, analyze data, and respond to students' learning.

**Person Responsible** Catherine Hiltunen (catherine.hiltunen@osceolaschools.net)

#### #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Improve Tier I instruction in Science instruction through the implementation of Marzano's teaching map cycle: Standards-Based Planning, Standard-Based Instruction, and Conditions of Learning. PLCs data analysis of common assessments will provide guidance and support for students in Tier 2 and 3 (Dufour, 2010; Marzano, 2003).

**Measureable Outcome:** Increase Science achievement level from 50% to 55%

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Catherine Hiltunen (catherine.hiltunen@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. PLC from each grade level will unpack essential standards and identify learning targets that most closely address the standards (Dufour, 2010)
2. Use NWEA data to develop instructional plans for interventions during Tier 1 instruction (Wise & kuhfeld, 2020)
3. Make Read, Talk, Write, Solve practices more evident in classes.
4. Utilize research-based practices/strategies to deliver Tier 1 instruction (Marzano, 2017)
5. The Stocktake process will take place monthly to assess progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Unpacking standards and ID targets- provides clarity for students and teachers
2. Analyze students' quantitative and qualitative data- to determine specific learning needs of students; develop instructional plan to meet needs; and evaluate effectiveness of the instruction students receive (Where are we now?)
3. Marzano Instructional Strategies- great effect size, has positive impact on students' learning where utilized
4. Reading - Writing - Talking - Solving strategies to fully engage students while processing curriculum content
5. Instructional Coaching-.help teachers develop repertoire of strategies to deliver effective Tier 1 instruction

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. PLC teams move towards stage six of the PLC process.
2. Use NWEA data to develop instructional plans for interventions during Tier 1 instruction.
3. Monitor READ, WRITE, TALK, SOLVE strategies
4. Utilize the Marzano Instructional Framework to deliver Tier 1 instruction
5. Stocktake meetings will monitor progress
6. Develop a systematic coaching calendar
7. Students will be provided Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction based on grade-level standards and content using data,
8. Offer job-embedded professional development.
9. Implement ELL Taskforce
10. Implement ESE Taskforce. SWDs will receive grade-level instruction that is scaffolded to meet their needs.
11. Implement AVID strategies schoolwide.
12. Administrators and instructional coaches team will attend weekly PLC team meetings to build capacity, analyze data, and respond to students' learning.

**Person Responsible** Catherine Hiltunen (catherine.hiltunen@osceolaschools.net)

**#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** ESSA data showed in 2018-19 that the school had one subgroup below the ESSA level of 41%. The data analysis show the need to improve learning gains for student with disabilities (SWD) and English Language Learners (ELLs).

**Measureable Outcome:** SWD will increase ELA achievement level from 26% to 29%, learning gains will increase from 38% to 41%, and SWD lowest quartile learning gains will increase from 31% to 34%.  
 SWD will increase Math achievement level from 29% to 32%, learning gains will increase from 48% to 51%, and SWD lowest quartile learning gains will increase from 44% to 47%.  
 ELL students will increase ELA achievement level from 31% to 34%, learning gains will increase from 42% to 45%, and ELL students lowest quartile learning gains will increase from 35% to 38%.  
 ELL students will increase mathematics achievement level from 36% to 39%, learning gains will increase from 54% to 57%, and ELL students lowest quartile learning gains will increase from 67% to 70%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Andrea Wold (andrea.wold@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Teachers will differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms seeking to provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all their students.
2. Integration of Guiding Coalition research and action items that will ensure PLCs address the needs of SWDs and ELLs
3. PLC Assessment Cycle & Use of Learning strategies as immediate error analysis and instruction in specific standards (Dufour, 2010)
4. Implementation of Check & Connect Mentor program for ESE students(Sinclair, Christenson, & Thurlow, 2005).
5. Better co-teach model for push in support facilitation teachers (Murawski, 2009)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Teachers understand how students learn at different rate therefore, it is an imperative to ensure SWDs and ELLs are receiving a guaranteed curriculum and students are learning at high levels (Marzano, 2009).

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Analyze NWEA data to guide the right interventions.
2. Assign a What I Need to Grow and Succeed (WING) intervention that will help fill gaps in existing grade level work
3. Provide "Develop a culture of commitment" PD to faculty.
4. Implement ELL Taskforce. The school EES will provide training and strategies to members of the taskforce in a monthly basis.
5. Implement ESE Taskforce. The school RCS will spearhead the taskforce and will establish a monthly meeting calendar to provide training on how to address the needs of our school's SWDs.
6. SWD will receive grade-level instruction. The work will be scaffolded to meet their needs and will be supported by the VE teacher when applicable. SWD will receive intervention based on their

Tier 3, Tier 2, and Tier 1 individual needs.

7. Schedule ESOL Paraprofessionals support to classrooms with high numbers of LY students.

**Person Responsible** Alexandra Lovegrove (alexandria.lovegrove@osceolaschools.net)

**#6. Other specifically relating to School wide culture of college and career**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Maintain a college and career culture school wide by providing students relevant information needed to make decision pertaining to their post-secondary options.

**Measureable Outcome:** 80% of the all students will complete a college and career survey.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Georgina Baba (georgina.baba@osceolaschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Students will receive a specific lesson in though the social studies classes to reach out to all students

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** There is a positive correlation between middle school students and career interest when they are aware of their post secondary options (Mau & Li, 2018).

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Schedule a College and Career Fair for all students
2. Collaborate with AVID coordinator to develop a college and career campus wide activities
3. Attend district college and career PD for counselors
4. Collaborate with teachers to schedule push in times to conduct lessons.
5. Deliver pre and post test
6. Collect data

**Person Responsible** Heather Summers (heather.summers@osceolaschools.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Increase achievement level in Social Studies from 74%to 79%.  
Increase middle school acceleration from 79% to 84%.**

**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.

Horizon positive culture and environment is aligning the Positive Behavior and Intervention System (PBIS). The PBIS pledge is the framework Horizon students is the SOAR expectations which stands for "Strive to do my best, Own my actions, have a positive Attitude, and show Respect". Teachers and staff continually acknowledge students who are following school expectation. Therefore, reinforcing the positive and maintaining a safe learning environment. At the end each nine weeks students who earn a predetermine amount of Eagle bucks (HZMS PBIS currency) is able to purchase a ticket to a celebration of success behaviors throughout the academic quarter. Student have many opportunities to spend Eagle Bucks at the SOAR store to buy snacks or other gifts. In the classroom, PBIS takes a serious tone when addressing discipline. Students get a chance to reflect upon the behavior a teacher points out during the Re-Focus time out. This procedure helps maintain the number of referrals down as teachers regain more control of their classroom discipline.

Horizon PBIS program also implemented a mentoring initiative and an intervention group for students who require more attention (Tier 2 or 3). Leadership staff is committed to mentor up to two students and getting to know them with the goal of holding them accountable for their behavior. Students in Tier 3 are placed in an intervention group for a 7-week term. During this time, students learned responsibility and how to be accountable for their own actions.

### 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: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0341 - Horizon Middle School			\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$8,200.00



	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0341 - Horizon Middle School			\$8,200.00
			<i>Notes: SAI funds enable students to complete Grade Recover in semester 1 and 2.</i>			
<b>6</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Other: School wide culture of college and career</b>				<b>\$600.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0341 - Horizon Middle School	TSSSA		\$600.00
			<i>Notes: Collage and Career event.</i>			
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$8,800.00</b>