School District of Osceola County, FL

Parkway Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Parkway Middle School

857 FLORIDA PKWY, Kissimmee, FL 34743

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Misty Cruz

Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (43%) 2020-21: (41%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

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.

Parkway Middle School promotes a supportive community that challenges students to embrace cultural inclusivity and become life-long learners in a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Parkway is a collaborative community that uses data to drive a rigorous, standards-based curriculum in order to excel in student achievement.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities	
Cruz, Misty	Principal		Oversees the operations of the school, provide instructional leadership to staff, and ensure the mission and vision of the school is accomplished. Provides instructional leadership and support to the Math, World Languages, and Science Departments, develops, submits and implements the school budget and funds, builds and strengthens community relationships, provides regular updates and communication regarding school performance to all stakeholders, works collaboratively with the School Advisory Council, plans and executes weekly administrative leadership meetings. She also facilitates regular Stocktake meetings throughout the school year and develops and monitors the School Improvement Plan.
Reid, Stephen	Assistant Principal		Oversees the operations of the school, provide instructional leadership to staff, and ensure the mission and vision of the school is accomplished. Provides instructional leadership and support to ELA, Arts and Design and PE/Health.
Vera, Yonney	Assistant Principal		Oversees the operations of the school, provide instructional leadership to staff, and ensure the mission and vision of the school is accomplished. Provides instructional leadership and support to Individual Societies, ESE and CTE.
Hare, Erika	Dean		Provides behavioral support and campus supervision. Participates in the collection of behavior data and manage interventions.
DaSilva, Najud	Instructional Coach		Provides coaching support for teachers in all MYP IB coordination. Provides MTSS support
Doodnath, Tagemattie	Guidance Counselor		Provides social and emotional support for our students. Assists with MTSS behavior. Contributes to the Threat Assessment Team
Lewis, Darren	Dean		Provides behavioral support and campus supervision. Participates in the collection of behavior data and manage interventions.
Porras, Janet	Reading Coach		Provides coaching support for teachers with instructional practices in literacy. Assists with MTSS for Reading.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities	
Rivera-Laracuente, Junelie	Guidance Counselor		Provides social and emotional support for our students. Assists with MTSS behavior. Contributes to the Threat Assessment Team.
Sierra Rosado, Glamarys	Instructional Coach		MTSS Coach. Manage the NWEA and FAST progress monitoring assessments. Analyze quarterly data and prepare intervention groups for students moving through different tiers of support.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 6/3/2022, Misty Cruz

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

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
23

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
55

Total number of students enrolled at the school
749

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
23

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
17

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	57	59	0	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	82	93	0	0	0	0	251
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	16	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	70	105	0	0	0	0	236
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	104	123	0	0	0	0	308
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	70	105	0	0	0	0	236

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	49	56	0	0	0	0	144

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	0	0	0	0	9

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/8/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	181	211	245	0	0	0	0	637
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	38	30	0	0	0	0	99
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	98	136	0	0	0	0	312
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	102	141	0	0	0	0	332
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	25	42	30	0	0	0	0	97

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	181	211	245	0	0	0	0	637
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	38	30	0	0	0	0	99
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	98	136	0	0	0	0	312
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	102	141	0	0	0	0	332
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	25	42	30	0	0	0	0	97

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	35%	44%	50%	39%			45%	45%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	37%	46%	48%	43%			40%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	29%	36%	38%	39%			31%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	28%	44%	54%	28%			40%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains	44%	54%	58%	26%			42%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	58%	55%	28%			40%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	49%	49%	42%			46%	47%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	53%	68%	71%	61%			71%	72%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	43%	48%	-5%	54%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	39%	47%	-8%	52%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
08	2022					
	2019	46%	49%	-3%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019	34%	45%	-11%	55%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	16%	30%	-14%	54%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
08	2022					
	2019	35%	47%	-12%	46%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	38%	42%	-4%	48%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	100%	62%	38%	67%	33%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	70%	73%	-3%	71%	-1%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	70%	49%	21%	61%	9%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	86%	44%	42%	57%	29%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	12	27	21	12	34	33	16	29			
ELL	24	31	30	21	45	53	21	42	68		
BLK	34	29	20	31	44	62	23	66	71		
HSP	33	37	30	26	44	53	33	48	76		
MUL	71	69		43	43						
WHT	46	44	25	35	49	50	57	75	78		
FRL	31	38	35	25	43	57	31	51	71		
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	11	34	39	17	25	21	13	48			
ELL	21	36	42	14	21	27	16	32	52		
BLK	45	52	40	30	35	37	41	67	72		
HSP	36	41	38	26	25	28	41	60	63		
MUL	53	50		36	25						
WHT	51	51	43	38	28	15	54	65	68		
FRL	33	40	38	21	23	30	34	54	55		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	28	20	21	35	30	23	38			
ELL	23	31	31	23	37	37	20	49	57		
ASN	50	33		57	42						
BLK	47	46	48	32	33	20	52	71	59		
HSP	43	39	29	39	43	43	43	69	74		
MUL	44	40		27	14						
WHT	51	43		53	44	58	64	79	87		
FRL	37	35	29	32	37	36	35	63	66		

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	433
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
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	51
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	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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

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

6, 7 and 8th grade ELA, Science and Civics scores continued to decline.

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

ELA achievement decreased 4% (38%-35%), learning gains decreased 6% (43%-37%) and lowest 25% decreased the most by 10% (39%-29%).

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

Three factors that contributed were the change in standards, SWD's and our English Language Learners. Work through Professional Learning Communities will focus on planning for differentiation, student centered learning and collaboration.

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

Math showed the most improvement. Math learning gains increased 18% (26%-44%) and math lowest 25% increased 25% (28%-53%). Math contributed to the increase in Middle School Acceleration by 12% (64%-76%).

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

PLC time was increased by adding an additional hour for PLC's to plan and to focus on tier 1 instruction.

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

Reading and writing across all content levels. Increase focus in professional learning communities on data and using the data to drive instruction will increase student achievement and learning gains in Math, ELA, Science, and Civics.

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

Professional Development on using data and creating interventions based on the data will be needed for Math and ELA. Continued professional development on aligning activities and skills to the learning target. Continued PD focus on IB inquiry and AVID strategies.

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

Teachers are paid for an extended hour of PLC time on a weekly basis for the whole school year.

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	ELA achievement has dropped to 35% attributed to the change in standards and learning loss during the pandemic. ELA is vital to all curricular areas.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	ELA proficiency will increase from 35% to 40% utilizing district and state assessments.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Common unit tasks and formative assessments tied to the benchmarks and criteria. NEST tool for walkthroughs and monthly Stocktake meetings will review the implementation of action steps and performance data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephen Reid (stephen.reid@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers in Professional Learning Communities will support literacy as they implement writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization, and reading (WICOR) as fundamental strategies to process the taught curricula.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	As an IB-Middle Years Program (MYP) school, the curriculum is taught at high levels integrating approaches to learning that afford opportunities for all students to develop their Ib learning attributes. Additionally, teachers will implement WICOR (AVID) strategies.

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 through Core Connections, reading interventions and ELL strategies.

Person Responsible	Janet Porras (janet.porras@osceolaschools.net)

Coaches meet with PLCs to discuss data, and model teaching strategies/ATLs.

Person Responsible	Stephen Reid (stephen.reid@osceolaschools.net)

PLCs will create common formative assessments based on IB criteria for every unit, disaggregate data and participate in reflective practice.

Person Responsible	Janet Porras (janet.porras@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers in PLCs will incorporate WICOR strategies to support ELA specific content.

Person Responsible	Janet Porras (janet.porras@osceolaschools.net)

Integrate MYP framework in lesson plans to provide high levels of rigor.

Person Responsible	Najud DaSilva (najud.dasilva@osceolaschools.net)

Structure and provide supports for Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions.

Person Responsible	Janet Porras (janet.porras@osceolaschools.net)

Examine subgroup NWEA/FAST data and make it available for teachers as they ensure all students are achieving at high levels.

Person Responsible
Glamarys Sierra Rosado
(glamarys.sierrarosado@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Math showed growth in all areas except grade 6. Students still lag from learning loss due to the pandemic.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Increase math proficiency from 28% to 33% utilizing district and state assessments.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Common unit tasks and formative assessments tied to benchmarks and criteria, NEST tool for walk-throughs, monthly Stocktake and district assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephen Reid (stephen.reid@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Deliberate data analysis of formative assessments that provides an instructional focus for PLCs addressing the needs of Tier 1, 2, and 3 students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	As an IB-Middle Years Program (MYP) school, the curriculum is taught at high levels integrating approaches to learning that afford opportunities for all students to develop their Ib learning attributes and improve mathematical skills.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Math teachers will attend professional development for content previews through district math resource teachers.

Person Responsible	Stephen Reid (stephen.reid@osceolaschools.net)

Coaches will meet with PLCs for data digging and model teaching strategies/ATLs, aligning to Best Standards.

Person Responsible	Najud DaSilva (najud.dasilva@osceolaschools.net)

Use of Edu Climber for Tier2/3 Interventions.

Person Responsible	Stephen Reid (stephen.reid@osceolaschools.net)

Use of Aleks for Levels 3, 4, and 5.

Person Responsible	Stephen Reid (stephen.reid@osceolaschools.net)

Professional development on new testing standards.

Person Responsible	Stephen Reid (stephen.reid@osceolaschools.net)

Use of PLCs to create reteach lessons for standards/topics not yet mastered based on progress monitoring.

Person Responsible	Stephen Reid (stephen.reid@osceolaschools.net)

Integrate MYP framework in lesson plans to provide high levels of rigor.

Person Responsible	Najud DaSilva (najud.dasilva@osceolaschools.net)

Teachers will incorporate WICOR strategies to support math content.

| **Person Responsible** | Stephen Reid (stephen.reid@osceolaschools.net) |

Examine subgroup NWEA/FAST data and make it available for teachers as they ensure all students are achieving at high levels.

| **Person Responsible** | Glamarys Sierra Rosado (glamarys.sierrarosado@osceolaschools.net) |

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Increasing achievement in science is critical as students learned through inquiry, research, and discovery to examine and provide reasoning thereby developing knowledge
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Increase science proficiency from 34% to 42%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Common unit task and formative assessments tied to benchmarks and criteria, NEST tool for walk-throughs, monthly stocktake and district assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephen Reid (stephen.reid@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Research shows how beneficial differentiating or adjusting instructions is students at any level of achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Research shows how beneficial differentiating or adjusting instructions is students at any level of achievement. The ability to implement various models of instructional practice based on the learners abilities yields high effect size (Almarode, Hattie, Fisher, & Frey, 2021)

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.

Instructional coaches meet monthly with PLC's to track data and model teaching strategies (ATL).

Person Responsible	Najud DaSilva (najud.dasilva@osceolaschools.net)

PLC's will create common formative assessments based on IB criteria for every unit.

Person Responsible	Najud DaSilva (najud.dasilva@osceolaschools.net)

PLC's will create common formative assessments based on IB criteria for every unit.

Person Responsible	Najud DaSilva (najud.dasilva@osceolaschools.net)

Provide continuous PD quarterly on effective MYP implementation.

Person Responsible	Najud DaSilva (najud.dasilva@osceolaschools.net)

Conduct classroom walk throughs focusing on student centered learning.

Person Responsible	Stephen Reid (stephen.reid@osceolaschools.net)

Implement standards-based stations utilizing differentiated instruction as a strategy to move students to mastery of content.

Person Responsible	Janet Porras (janet.porras@osceolaschools.net)

Examine subgroup NWEA/FAST data and make it available for teachers as they ensure all students are achieving at high levels.

Person Responsible	Glamarys Sierra Rosado (glamarys.sierrarosado@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Culture and Environment	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Panorama survey results show students feel detached from school and no sense of belonging. Staff insight survey results show staff feels the same. Detachment to school, lack of engagement will negatively impact student academic performance.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Increase student sense of belonging on the Panorama Survey from 31% to 35%. Increase staff sense of belonging on the Insight survey from 40% to 50%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Panorama data (fall and spring) for students and Insight Survey for staff. Survey teachers throughout year in PLCs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Yonney Vera (yonney.vera@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Afford multiple opportunities for students and staff to communicate their sense of belonging and connection to the school community.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	A positive sense of belonging within a school creates a better place to learn and work. Additionally, this is positively correlated to improved academic achievement as well as providing a safe environment for students and staff (Hattie, 2021, Muhammad & Cruz, 2019, Gennari, Meloniuo, & Rizvi,20217)

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.	

Leadership team will participate and observe Friday GRIT.

Person Responsible	Yonney Vera (yonney.vera@osceolaschools.net)

Homeroom GRIT lessons will be provided to teachers in the areas of IB, PBIS, Character Strong.

Person Responsible	Yonney Vera (yonney.vera@osceolaschools.net)

Develop parent workshops that will help build stronger relationships
within the school community. Workshops on IB Middle Year Program awareness, PBIS, and Culinary arts.

Person Responsible	Najud DaSilva (najud.dasilva@osceolaschools.net)

Monthly SEL lessons provided by guidance counselors and district to be taught by all teachers in homeroom GRIT.

Person Responsible	Junelie Rivera-Laracuente (junelie.riveralaracuente@osceolaschools.net)

PBIS focus on positive behavior and rewards (Pirate bucks, events, spirit days).

Person Responsible	Yonney Vera (yonney.vera@osceolaschools.net)

Implement student leaders, forum for feedback and involvement.

Person Responsible	Erika Hare (erika.hare@osceolaschools.net)

Post-Secondary Culture: Students will complete lesson in Xello at 85% completion.

Person Responsible	Junelie Rivera-Laracuente (junelie.riveralaracuente@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Teacher planning of lessons and disaggregating student achievement data is crucial for student achievement success. Time spent in PLCs need to be structured and equipped with agendas that will produce highly rigorous lesson that are inquiry based.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	All PLCs will reach at least a level 5 in the PLC self-assessment outlined in the Seven Stages of Professional Learning Teams.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Use of the PLC Analysis Protocol Tool to review data by instructional coaches, leadership and administration. All three groups will also actively participate in PLCs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Yonney Vera (yonney.vera@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Teachers in Professional Learning Communities will support their subjects as well as literacy across all curriculums as they implement writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization, and reading (WICOR) as fundamental strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	As an IB-Middle Years Program (MYP) school, the curriculum is taught at high levels integrating approaches to learning that afford opportunities for all students to develop their IB learning attributes. Additionally, teachers will implement WICOR (AVID) strategies.

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.	

Modeling and creating PLC expectations and protocols for teachers.

Person Responsible	Yonney Vera (yonney.vera@osceolaschools.net)

PLCs will use the CUPS and MYP framework to plan lessons and submit weekly.

Person Responsible	Yonney Vera (yonney.vera@osceolaschools.net)

PLCs will collaborate on best practices and incorporate AVID strategies.

Person Responsible	Yonney Vera (yonney.vera@osceolaschools.net)

MYP implementation and use of Managebac to build unit/lesson plans using Approach to Learning (ATL) skills aligned to targets and student tasks to the benchmarks.

Person Responsible	Najud DaSilva (najud.dasilva@osceolaschools.net)

Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

Parkway's positive culture and environment use the PBIS framework and has received the recognition of PBIS Model School for two years consecutively. The GRIT model for PBIS sets the operating expectations for Growth, Respect & Responsibility, Integrity, and Tenacity with the following mission statement:
To foster a supportive system of interventions and rewards that develop character and motivate all stakeholders to become positive members of all communities, both locally and globally.
Students are recognized every day for their positive behavior to reinforce and affirm positive interactions.
IB learner profile attributes are also intertwined within the GRIT model.
a. Growth - Reflective, Thinker, Inquirer, and knowledgeable
b. Respect & Responsibility - Caring, Thinker, Principled, and Knowledgeable
c. Integrity - Communicator, Thinker, Open-Minded, and Knowledgeable
d. Tenacity - Balanced, Thinker, Risk-Taker, and Knowledgeable
The token economy uses Pirate Bucks to make purchases in the PBIS store. Staff members will acknowledge and compliment students who are exhibiting GRIT behavior by giving them specific, positive feedback, along with a PIRATE BUCK ticket. Students can redeem their tickets at the school pirate store and individual classroom stores. All students are eligible to receive PIRATE BUCKS and teachers are encouraged to develop positive relationships with students by getting to know them and hopefully becoming trusted adults and approachable

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

The PBIS school contact person is Cristian Vazquez-Hogue, and the team is comprised of the following staff:
PBIS LEAD-C. Vasquez
ADMIN - Y. Vera
DATA - Hare and Lewis
PBIS STORE - C. Pabon
Events-M. Brady
Other members: J. Rivera and G. Sierra